FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 235 6 December 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Text of 5 Dec Foreign Ministry Press Conference AA 1
TASS Provides 'Text' of Questions, Answers AA 18
Comparison of Foreign Ministry Press Conference [PRAVDA 6 Dec] AA 23
'Soviet Source' Cited on Arms Talks Prospects [Paris LE FIGARO 1 Dec] AA 24
Reagan Urged To 'Save Mankind' From Destruction [Kharkov] AA 26
West's 'Illusions' on USSR Return to INF Scored [Levin] AA 27
Expenditures on New Arms Race Round Decried [Bovin] AA 28
START Delegations Hold Plenary Session 6 Dec AA 29
Scientists' Meeting on Arms Issues Detailed AA 29
Comparison of TASS Report on Kohl INF Claims AA 29

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers Meet in Sofia BB 1
E. European Leaders Support Soviet INF Policy [Skvortsov in PRAVDA 3 Dec] BB 1
CEMA Foreign Trade Commission Meets in Moscow [IZVESTIYA 3 Dec] BB 2
Patolichev Meets With Nestorowicz [Warsaw] BB 2

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Bovin Analyzes Delhi Commonwealth Conference CC 1
Balebanov Details Upcoming 'NATO Week' Agenda CC 2
Euromissiles Pose 'Threat' to Africa, Mideast [Vasilets] CC 2
Bloc Appeal at UN Against 'Economic Dictate' CC 3
EEC Meeting in Athens Reaches 'Deadlock' CC 3
UN Deliberations on Namibian Issue Noted [Kalyagin] CC 4
Comparison of Shitikov, Zagladin Conference CC 5

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Lebanon, INF 'Pretexts' for U.S. 'Militarism' [Ponomarev] A 1
Moscow Roundtable Scores U.S. 'Misperceptions' [Sofia OTECHESTVEN FRONT 1 Dec] A 2
U.S. Estimate of USSR Defense Budget 'Foul Play' [Soltan] A 9

'Upsurge' Seen in U.S. Nuclear Freeze Movement A 10
Canadian CP 'Condemns' U.S. INF Deployment A 10

CHINA

Wu Xueqian Remarks on USSR, U.S. Missiles Scored B 1
[A. Petrov in IZVESTIYA 6 Dec]
Goods Transport Lines With PRC Resumed B 1
PRC Translators of USSR Literary Works Awarded B 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

U.S., Not USSR, 'Threatening' Asian Region C 1
[Matveyev in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Dec]
Japanese Businessmen Hold Trade Talks in Moscow C 2
Patolichev Signs Trade Protocol With Mongolia C 2
WPK Plenum Discusses DPRK Economic Development C 2

SOUTH ASIA

DRA Statement on U.S. 'Interference' Cited D 1
DRA Premier Interviewed on USSR-DPA Relations D 1
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Dec]
Nuriyev Attends Moscow DRA Treaty Commemoration D 4
[IZVESTIYA 4 Dec]
Karmal Speaks in Kabul on Friendship With USSR D 4
Sarboland Applauds USSR Aid at Kabul Meeting D 4
[IZVESTIYA 3 Dec]
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on USSR-DRA Treaty Anniversary D 6
[Cherneta 3 Dec]
DRA's Salang Highway Exemplifies USSR Friendship D 8
[Leshchinskiy, Fadeyev]
Karmal Discusses DRA Nationalities Question D 10
Arkhipov Arrives in Delhi for Cooperation Talks D 10
Bangladesh Army 'Dissatisfaction' With Regime Noted D 10
[Akhmedzyanov in IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Australians 'Unhappy' Over U.S. Bases' 'Threat' E 1
[Volodin in IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]
Talyzin Attends LPDR Anniversary Meeting E 2
[PRAVDA 3 Dec]
USSR-Laos Economic Ties Examined by Joint Panel E 2
[IZVESTIYA 3 Dec]
Thai Envoy At Moscow Thai National Day Soiree E 3
[IZVESTIYA 4 Dec]

EASTERN EUROPE

Kapitonov Meets With Visiting CPCZ Delegation F 1
[PRAVDA 4 Dec]
USSR's Patolichev, CSSR's Urban Sign Trade Pact F 1
[IZVESTIYA 3 Dec]

USSR-Poland Talks Held 'In Fraternal Friendship' F 2
[IZVESTIYA 3 Dec]
Husak, Kadar Visits to Poland, GDR Discussed [Olenichev] F 3
Text of Chnoupek Interview on Missiles, USSR Ties F 4
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 Dec]

WESTERN EUROPE

Ponomarev, Zimyanin Receive DKP Delegation G 1
French Ties to NATO Seen at 'New Level' G 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Dec]
Soviet-Finnish Legal Commission Meets in Moscow G 1
[IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]
Finnish-Soviet Congress Activities Reported G 2
2 Dec Opening G 2
Missile Deployment Decried [Dodonov] G 2
French Defense Minister's Speech at WEU Cited G 3
Briefs: Cooperation Program With Netherlands G 3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

TASS Statement on U.S. Air Attack in Lebanon H 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Dec]
Khaddam Writes Security Council on U.S. 'Raid' H 1
Syrian UN Delegate Hits U.S.-Israeli Agreement H 2
Shultz Confirms U.S. 'Right' to 'Piratic Raids' H 2
Reagan Tries to Justify 'Barbarous' Bombings H 3
Speakes Says Flights Over Lebanon To Continue H 3
U.S. 'Bandit Attacks' Cause 'Deliberate' Strain H 4
U.S.-Israeli Military 'Collusion' Examined H 5
[Nikolayev]
Reagan 'Hatching Plans' for Attack on Syria H 6
U.S. 'Brazen Behavior' Impedes Lebanon Agreement H 6
'Deliberately Blocks' Solution H 7
U.S. Mideast Policy During Election Year Viewed H 7
[Dunayev]
Moscow Meeting Expresses Support for PLO H 7
[IZVESTIYA 30 Nov]
USSR, Egypt Sign Protocol to Increase Trade H 8
[PRAVDA 3 Dec]
USSR's Ogarkov on 'Friendly Visit' to Algeria H 8

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Retiring RSFSR Transport Minister Replaced R 1
[IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]
Academy of Sciences Official Decorated R 1
[IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]
Turkmen Central Committee Presidium Meets R 1
[TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 19 Nov]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Supreme Soviet Commission Discusses Energy S 1
[Grinko in IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]
Railways Minister 'Embarrassed' Over Service S 3

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

RSFSR, Armenia Meet Agricultural Sales Targets T 1
[PRAVDA 27 Nov]
Seed Procurement, Improvement 'Immediate' Task T 1
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 1 Dec]
'Struggle' Necessary To Correct Repair Situation T 3
[Mikhaylov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Nov]
Kolkhozes, Sovkhozes Use State Bank Credit T 5

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Armed Forces Political Seminar Held 28 Nov-3 Dec V 1
[PRAVDA 4 Dec]
Yepishev Addresses Meeting V 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Dec]

TEXT OF 5 DEC FOREIGN MINISTRY PRESS CONFERENCE

LD051201 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Press conference held by Leonid Zamyatin, head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee; Marshal Nikolay Ogarkov, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces; and Georgiy Korniyenko, first deputy minister of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow; statements and answers by Soviet officials in Russian with superimposed translation -- live]

[Text] [Zamyatin] The news conference is devoted to one of the most pressing international issues, the deployment that has begun in Western Europe of first-strike nuclear missiles. This reckless step has cancelled the possibility of continuing the Geneva talks and has shown clearly that the United States and several other NATO countries are trying to upset the approximate parity of military forces, including nuclear forces, between the NATO and Warsaw Treaty organizations, which assured security and stability in Europe. This creates an entirely new situation, which is giving rise to concern and alarm among the peoples of Europe and the world as a whole. The highly principled stand taken by the Soviet Union in this matter and the evaluation of the latest developments connected with the deployment of American nuclear missiles has been given in Yuriy Andropov's statement, which formulated the Soviet people's will and determination to reliably protect the security of the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community. I would like to stress in particular that Yuriy Andropov, at this difficult moment in the international situation, has appealed to the leaders of the United States and the states of Western Europe to weigh once again all the consequences that could flow from the deployment of new American missiles in Europe, consequences for their own peoples and for the whole of mankind. Yuriy Andropov appealed to responsible statesmen in the West to take rational decisions and, thus, save mankind from the menace of nuclear war, to protect them from the nuclear danger. This, he said, can be done only by human reason.

In the light of this statement and on its basis we would like to analyze at this news conference the situation that is arising with the start of the deployment of the new American missiles. I call upon Georgiy Korniyenko:

[Korniyenko] By beginning the deployment of intermediate-range missiles in Europe, Washington is now trying to make it appear as if nothing particular has happened. Such a course followed by Washington scarcely arouses surprise. It shows once again that -- that is, if anyone doubted this -- that the present American Administration had no wish at all to reach a mutually acceptable agreement at the talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe. The United States, from the very start, deliberately worked for a failure at the Geneva talks. It came to these talks with a position, known as the zero option, clearly unacceptable to the Soviet Union, which would have meant zero missiles for the Soviet Union and zero cuts for NATO. This was clearly absurd and the United States soon had to give up this position. Nevertheless, it continued up to the last day of the talks to adopt an equally unrealistic position. The sum total of this position remained to same, with a few variations of detail. The Soviet Union had to make dractic cuts in its intermediate-range nuclear systems -- moreover, not only in the European part of the country -- and the United States was to be permitted, on the contrary, to substantially increase the already considerable arsenal of intermediate-range nuclear missiles that NATO had in Western Europe. In other words, the American aim was clearly to deadlock the talks as soon as possible and begin deploying its missiles in Europe. Naturally, therefore, Washington sees nothing particular in what is taking place. This was its aim.

All this, however, in no way belittles the responsibility of the United States for what it has done, for forcing on the world a new spiral of the arms race,for heightening international tension. The responsibility for the situation that has arisen, including the responsibility for the breakdown of the talks, is also shared by those who gave the green light to the deployment of American missiles on European soil. These are, first and foremost, the Governemnts of the Federal Republic of Germany, Britain and Italy. A share of the responsibility also rests with the governments of those countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which, although they are not accepting missiles on their territory, are supporting the American position and have thereby contributed to the breakdown of the talks. Nothing other than a desire to evade responsibility is the present Washngton attitude, also the attitude in other Western capitals, affecting optimism and claiming that the Soviet Union will tomorrow, if not today, return to the talks despite the deployment of American missiles. The Soviet Union, needless to say, would not like to consider the present situation irreversible. If the NATO countries display a readiness to return to the situation that existed before the deployment of the American missiles in Europe began, the Soviet Union will also be able to return to the talks. This has been clearly stated in Yuriy Andropov's statement on 24 November. This also follows from the invariable, highly principled position of the Soviet Union, its aim of halting the arms race and, above all, the nuclear arms race, its course aimed at reducing and eventually completely eliminating the nuclear war danger. This is the only rational road suggested by human reason. But to attribute to the Soviet Union a readiness to continue the talks as if nothing had happened, to the accompaniment of the installation of American missiles in Europe, this means not simply to engage in wishful thinking for the sake of calming oneself, it means deliberately misleading one's own people and the world public with the purpose of taking the edge off the mass protests against the deployment. But that is, as we say, an attempt with unsuitable means. Deceptions do not last long.

I now call upon Marshal Ogarkov.

[Ogarkov] Gentlemen, comrades. I would like to dwell briefly on the military aspect of some of the points made in the statement by Yuriy Andropov, the leader of our party and state. First of all, it is clearly shown in the statement that it is the United States that, by its actions, upset the possibility of reaching a mutually acceptable agreement at the talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe. The United States, and some of its allies, are now trying to absolve themselves of any responsibility for the break-down of the talks. In so dong they have reached an absurd claim, asserting that the deployment of Pershings and cruise missiles in Europe is justified. That it is supposedly even necessary to abolish what they call a Soviet monoploy on intermediate-range missiles. Reality, however, completely upsets this. Let us turn to the facts.

[Translator] Marshal Ogarkov is going to the board, where there is a diagram of missile strength.

[Ogarkov] The Soviet Union today has in Europe 938 nuclear intermediate-range launch vehicles. These are 465 bombers and 473 missiles, a good half of which are old missiles. The NATO bloc has 857 such launch vehicles, 695 aircraft and 162 British and French missiles. As you see, we have a few more launch vehicles, 10 percent more than NATO has, and NATO has more warheads, nearly 50 percent more. On the whole, however, there is a rough parity in this type of nuclear arms in Europe. Such are the facts.

The Soviet Union, at the very start of the talks, made a fundamental proposal to completely abolish nuclear arms in Europe, tactical as well as intermediate-range and thereby to rid Europe of nuclear weapons of these classes. This proposal was however rejected.

In these circumstances the Soviet Union proposed reducing the number of intermediate-range nuclear missiles launch vehicles by two-thirds to about 300 on each side with equal sublevels in missiles, 62 [as heard] on each side. At the same time it agreed to abolish, to destroy -- not to redeploy but to destroy -- all the missiles to be reduced in the West and to reduce the number of its SS ...[Ogarkov corrects himself] and to freeze the number of its SS-20 missiles in the East. The interests of Britain and France would in that case in no way be infringed upon. Their nuclear arms would simply be taken into account. But this proposal, too, was turned down.

Subsequently, to facilitate agreement, the Soviet Union proceeded even further. It agreed that the Soviet SS-20 missiles have as many warheads as Britain and France have on their missiles, and since they have 420 or 430 warheads, and each of our SS-20s has three warheads, we agreed to keep in Europe only 140 missiles, that is even fewer than Britain and France now have. The rest, 333 missile-launchers, would be destroyed. What Soviet monopoly can, in this case, one speak of. It is perfectly clear that the possibility of reaching a mutually acceptable agreement on this basis was complete, but there was no willingness to reach such an agreement on the part of the United States. On the contrary, what was it that the United States proposed?

Under their zero option the United States [as heard] would have had to abolish all its intermediate-range nuclear missiles, keeping only aircraft, whereas the NATO bloc would completely retain all its nuclear systems, in this way achieving a double superiority in launch vehicles and a triple superiority in warheads. The unacceptability, I would even say the absurdity of this proposal is perfectly obvious. Subsequently, under the interim plan the Soviet Union would have been permitted, with United States consent, to keep a certain number of its missiles but with the simultaneous deployment of an equal number of American missiles in Europe. As you see, in that case, too, the NATO bloc would have received a double superiority. I ask you, where is the logic of this and who, in that case, and why, has torpedoed the talks? The answer is perfectly clear: The United States Administration.

By the way, this is also the approach of the United States at the talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms. Let me give just one example. The essence of the Soviet proposal at the talks is to reduce the composition of the strategic nuclear forces of both sides by about 25 percent as a start, to the level of 1,800 systems, with an equal number of nuclear warheads on them for the Soviet Union and the United States at a level lower than the existing one. What does the United States, on the other hand propose? Only reducing the land and sea-based systems, retaining about 5,000 warheads on them and practically not reducing strategic aircraft, each of which in the United States carries up to 20 missiles; not bombs mind you, missiles, nuclear missiles with a range from the aircraft of 2,600 kilometers. The Soviet Union has fewer than 1,000 missiles on such aircraft. The United States has 8,000. As a result, here too the United States will obtain a more than double superiority. Besides this, and this is no less important, the adoption of this American proposal would have led to a fundamental break-down of the structure of the Soviet strategic nuclear forces with expenses running into billions for us; into billions. Naturally we could not have agreed to this.

Such are the facts of the case. The question arises do the Americans understand the absurdity of their proposals? Unquestionably, unquestionably. What is more, they probably counted on this, and today we have every reason to say that in beginning the Geneva talks the United States Administration did not want, did not want, I repeat, a mutually acceptable agreement on nuclear arms in Europe. It did everything to prevent United States Administration at the talks on limiting and reducing strategic nuclear arms.

Further, it is known that the Soviet Union continues to adhere to its highly principled course aimed at halting the arms race, and above all the nuclear arms race. The buildup of these arms is becoming simply senseless, judge for yourselves. Today the United States can already -- just in a first strike by its strategic forces -- use over 12,000 nuclear warheads. This is just the throw weight of the strategic forces. The United States, all in all, together with the NATO countries, has over 40,000 such warheads. Why then with such an enormous number of nuclear systems existing is Washington determined to deploy its missiles in Europe? Because it would like to give its strategic nuclear forces the capability to inflict a disarming nuclear strike, that is, a strike that would deprive the Soviet Union of the chance to retaliate at the aggressor.

Is this goal achievable? The answer to that is unambiguous: No, and once again, no. In present day conditions when both sides have such enormous stockpiles of nuclear weapons and diverse systems for launching them, land, sea and air-based, with repeatedly redundant systems of controlling them, this is ruled out. Retaliation will in any case be certain.

Therefore, to rely on such a nuclear strike, this is something that can be done only by adventurers or suicidally inclined people.

One more question deserves mention. Considering the increased nuclear menace, the Soviet leadership, as you know, had to take certain measures in reply. They are set forth in the statement I referred to and I would merely like to take this opportunity to stress their adequacy. The Soviet systems to be deployed in the oceans and seas and relevant to the territory of the United States itself, will be no less effective than the American systems that are being deployed in Europe, in range, in yield, in accuracy, and what is especially important, in flight time to their targets. These reply measures are of a forced nature. With the deployment of the American Pershings and cruise missiles there will be a change in the military balance in Europe and globally in favor of the United States. This is something we naturally cannot allow, considering this we will also take other steps to assure the security of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. The United States will not have a superiority.

At the same time, in Yuriy Andropov's statement it was stressed that our steps in reply will be kept within those limits that are dictated by the actions of the NATO countries and that the Soviet leadership, fulfilling the Soviet people's will, will continue to do everything possible to remove the threat of a new war and preserve peace.

[Translator] We have a number of questions. Permit me to read the first question. The first question, to Comrade Ogarkov, from a PRAVDA correspondent, Rusakov:

The leaders of the NATO countries maintain that it's the Soviet SS-20 missiles that are the source of the critical situation in Europe. What would you say to that?

[Ogarkov] That is not so. The Soviet missiles SS-20 did not upset the rough parity of the sides in intermediate-range nuclear arms and actually could not be a source of the critical situation that has arisen. The fact of the matter is that by, in deploying each two SS-20 missiles the Soviet Union removed three SS-4 or SS-5 missiles. As a result, by the beginning of the deployment of the SS-20 we had 600 missiles now we have only 473. Secondly, the yield of the nuclear warheads on the SS-4 and SS-5 missiles is far superior to the overall, the total yield of the SS-23 warheads.

As a result, the total yield of our missiles in the West far from increasing, has been halved, or to be more exact, by a factor of 1.7. Therefore the critical situation is being created not by thse missiles. True the number of nuclear warheads on our missiles is somewhat greater than the number of warheads on the missiles of the NATO bloc in Western Europe, but the overall number of nuclear warheads on all the delivery systems in Europe is 50 percent greater on the NATO side and the situation, the critical situation that is really critical, is being created by the deployment of American missiles in Europe which alters the strategic situation and does really create a dangerous state of affairs.

[Unidentified speaker] I would like to add someting that has a direct relevance to what Marshal Ogarkov said. The British newspaper OBSERVER which, as you know, does not display particular sympathies for the Soviet Union, on 16 October reported -- carried -- an article based on secret documents of the State Department and the Defense Department of the United States relating to 1978-79 and touching upon the preparations for what is known as the double track decision, what is really a one-track decision, of the NATO Council taken in December 1979. These documents make it absolutely clear, something that was quite clear to us in the Soviet Union from the very outset and what Marshal Ogarkov just spoke of, namely the decision to deploy American missiles in Europe was taken by no means because the replacement of SS-4 missiles and SS-5 missiles by SS-20 missiles had upset the situation. But, and this is not just a conclusion reached by the author of that article in the OBSERVER. He quotes a document which said that by [speaker correct himself] that the established, the historically established level of Soviet intermediate range missiles of the SS-4 and SS-5 types was such that their replacement by SS-20 missiles cannot in any way substantially increase the threat to NATO. To this one may add that the real aim of the deployment of the American missiles which has now begun, its real aim was clearly formulated by the defense secretary of the time in the United States, Brown, at a closed door meeting of one of the committees of the United States Senate in December, 1979, when Brown said that this step, the deployment of the American missiles, would enable NATO by the mid-80's to achieve a clear military advantage, a net military gain, as he said. That is, in simpler terms, a military superiority. This is undoubtedly an illusory aim but the very tendency to achieve it, as we see, leads to highly negative effects for the cause of peace.

[Translator] A question now from a correspondent of the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA newspaper in the Soviet Union: The Federal German chancellor claims that the deployment of American missiles in that country will assure that the deployment of American missiles in that country will assure the security of the Federal Republic. What would you say to that?

[Ogarkov] Yes, we know of such a statement by the federal chancellor to the effect that nuclear deterrence is the best guarantee of preventing war. By following this logic it would turn out that the more nuclear weapons there are in the West the stronger would peace be. I feel that everyone sitting here realizes how utterly incongruent such a statement is, and to hear this said by the leader of a country that has in this century started two world wars, however, itself suffered their grim consequences, this is strange indeed. I would say that it is dangerous, dangerous, above all, for the Federal Republic. Of course, in deploying American missiles on Federal German territory they are seeking to increase the nuclear threat to the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community, but at the same time they are drastically increasing the threat to the Federal Republic of Germany, too.

[Unidentified speaker] By turning the territory of the Federal Republic into a launching pad for American missiles, they are inevitably turning it also into a target for retaliation, with all the consequences flowing from that. Therefore, the nearsightedness displayed here is nearsightedness that has never led to favorable results.

[Translator] There are a number of questions I'd like Comrade Korniyenko to answer. A question from the Moscow correspondent of TIMES [as heard]. President Andropov on 24 November said that the Soviet Union would restart the talks if the condition prevailing before the deployment would prevail. PRAVDA wrote that this is not only a question of the Soviet Union's readiness but a question of taking the NATO rockets out of Europe. What is correct? There is a question of the same kind from the Czechoslovak radio who asks: (?Does the West) [word indistinct] when the West says that the Soviet Union is ready to renew its talks? An analagous question comes from the Bulgarian paper OTECHESTVEN FRONT.

[Korniyenko] The statements made in West of that kind have appeared -- I would say -- have appeared from what Mr Kohl has said and after what has been said in the PRAVDA, and I see one of those asking the question is referring to PRAVDA. The chancellor has really very persistently...the chancellor continues to persistently harp on his statement. To prove what he says, he quotes just one phrase, that the Soviet Union does not consider the situation irreversible. You have to have a very rich fantasy and imagination to understand this phrase in such a light, that the Soviet Union is supposedly ready to renew its talks in Geneva under the accompaniment of the American rockets deployed in Europe. I would say it is also surprising that, answering the questions of the journalists, maybe in the message of Mr Andropov there is something that could be understood as the chancellor says no and that the phrase is final. [sentence as heard] Taking into consideration all these inaccuracies and to make things straight, I will allow myself to quote the whole actual final paragraph of the statement made by us. Here is how it sounds -- I am quoting:

We would not want to consider the situation as irreversible if in the West there is a different, realistic approach to the problem of security. If the NATO countries show a readiness to return to the situation that existed before the deployment in Europe of American missiles, then this, you can be sure, will find a corresponding response on our side. I think that further commentaries are unnecessary. As for the question of whether there is a contradiction between what was said in the statement by Yuriy Andropov and what Andrey Gromyko said and in the publications of the PRAVDA, I think it can easily be said there is absolutely no contradiction in the statements by the two leaders and the PRAVDA.

(?What) we did was quoted what was said in the statement and this was repeated: That if on the part of NATO there is the readiness to return to the situation which existed before the deployment, then the Soviet Union -- only then -- will the Soviet Union be ready to reciprocate. This is not an abstract readiness, but an actual, a factual readiness. It is in the first part in order for there to be a readiness on our part. I think this is elementary logic.

[Translator] A series of questions, all on one theme. THE DAILY TELEGRAPH of England, REUTERS of England, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT ask: How is Yuriy Andropov's health? When will he appear publicly or when will he return to his work?

[Zamyatin] [Translator omits first few words] led the Council of Defense during Comrade Andropov's illness, I will answer that just recently Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov in his apt letter to the leaders of the physicians for peace, said he could not, because of a cold, meet them. At present, Yuriy Andropov is getting better and he is tackling in full measure party business, affairs of state, and the affairs of the Council of Defense.

[Translator] The next question? STAMPA, the newspaper STAMPA of Italy, to Marshal Ogarkov. Please tell us in detail how do you get the figure 430 warheads for 162 launch vehicles for Britain and France?

[Ogarkov] Let us do a little bit of arithmetic. The English have 4 submarines; three of them have rockets -- 16 Polaris (?AC3) -- that is 43 [number as heard] rockets. Every such rocket has six warheads. Multiplied you get 288. The fourth submarine has old rockets -- Polaris A-3 -- with three MIRV warheads. That is 16 times 3 is 48. So you get 336 warheads -- English submarines. Five French submarines, (?none of them blocked), 16 launchers on each. That's 80. 336 and 80 is 400 -- I got mixed-up myself -- 412 [number as heard]. Plus the French rockets, land-based rockets -- 18 of them. So you get 430. I think this is.. [Ogarkov corrects himself] so it has been checked and just double-checked by specialists and correspondents. So there can be no mistake here whatsoever.

[Translator] A question by the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT correspondent and a question of the LOS ANGELES TIMES. Why is the Soviet Union stating that it will not return to the talks in Geneva until the Pershing II's and the cruises are not [as heard] taken out of Europe? Taking such a position, you undermine your position in the West as a serious partner in the talks. The correspondent of the LOS ANGELES TIMES adds: Why does the Soviet Union not participate in the talks in Geneva and how does this fit with the Soviet interest in peace and in limiting nuclear arms? How does this tie in with Soviet desire?

[Unidentified speaker] Thank you for thinking of our reputation, but I don't think we need such care on somebody else's part. Why have we stated what we did state, not what Mr Danilov stated? This has been explained in detail. As for a reputation of a serious partner at the talks, such a reputation has been lost by the American side, not by us, because it, the American side, from the very beginning showed at the talks that it was not willing to come to an agreement, and that the agreement they needed only as a screen, as a cover, for preparing the deployment and for the fulfillment of their plans. And to continue the talks under such conditions, when the United States has already started deployment, would be equivalent to helping fool the world public opinion -- and that we do not want to do.

[Translator] Correspondent (Wischnewdki) LIBRE BELGIQUE. As one of the measures in answer to the deployment, it has been stated that the Soviet Union will take measures. Does this in any way touch upon the Soviet pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons?

[Unidentified speaker] This pledge was taken not in the context of the Geneva agreements [as heard]. Our pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons holds true and will hold true.

[Translator] (Helmut Wienand) UNSERE ZEIT, of the FRG. Marshal Ogarkov, could you name the aims of the operative-tactical missiles in the GDR and in Czechoslovakia, which was announced as one of the measures in answer to the deployment?

[Ogarkov] The deployment of the Soviet operative-tactical missiles of a longer range has as its aim to neutralize the superiority which NATO and the United States -- the United States thinks it will get -- by deploying the Pershings on the territory of Federal Germany.

[Translator] There is a question from the correspondent of THE DAILY TELEGRAPH of England. What is your evaluation of the latest events between Syria and the United States in the Middle East? What aid is the Soviet Union ready to give Syria in case of a development of the conflict?

[Zamyatin] I would like to say that what is going on today in Lebanon -- when the American Air Force supported by the Navy ships is shelling and bombing of [as heard] foreign territory, of Lebanese territory, and shelling positions of those forces which are there on a legal basis, the forces which represent the inter-Arab forces -- this is a new factor of aggression, which is being perpetrated by the United States for over a year, by the Israeli forces, supported by the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

The U.S. President -- trying to make up for the attack of 28 American bombers on the positions of the Syrian forces, which are on Lebanese territory -- the President said that the United States, so to say, is defending the marines. We would like to ask: Who asked the marines to come to Lebanon? They came as a force which represents an invasion by an -- by aggressive forces of the United States, in addition to the Israeli forces which are trampling underfoot Lebanese soil and trampling underfoot all international law and international behavior. This is not the type of relations that can exist between nations. They are trampling underfoot the UN Charter.

The question is: What they want to do is to expand the U.S. interference on Lebanese soil. That is the only way -- the way we look upon it -- the new American act of aggression against the Syrian Armed Forces which are on Lebanese soil. We censure and condemn this act of aggression. Soviet public opinion is censuring this. And the Arab countries will take the measure necessary. And our support, both moral and material, is on the part of the Arab nations, which are conducting a very difficult fight against an aggressor -- which has invaded their territory (?with) the Israeli aggressor -- and against the American aggressor. They are united today not only by an agreement on strategic cooperation but by a military pact, a military alliance which was accepted, adopted only a few days ago when the Israeli premier met the President of the United States and when they decided on military, joint military-action against Lebanon. That is how we evaluate the position in this part of the world. We condemn it. We censure it. And we will support those who are fighting against the Israeli and American aggression in this district.

[Korniyenko] I would like to remind you of the fact that in defining aggression -- which was worked out and adopted by the UN Organization in 1974, under the notion of the act of aggression -- we understand one thing: not only the attack or invasion of the territory of this or that nation by another nation, but the attack by the armed forces of one nation on the land and sea or air vessels or forces or navies of another nation.

I would like to give the floor to somebody in the hall. Please. Please name yourself and the paper you represent.

[Translator] RHEINISCHE POST, Federal Germany. Comrade Marshal Ogarkov, you have answered about the new Soviet rockets in the GDR and Czecholovakia. The Soviet Union has often accused the United States of making their allies in Europe nuclear hostages.

How do you explain the fact that the Soviet Union is now making the GDR and Czechoslovakia nuclear hostages? [pause in proceedings] The question is being translated again into Russian. The question is being explained to Marshal Ogarkov. Your answer please, Marshal Ogarkov.

[Ogarkov] Who started to deploy rockets in Europe? Did the Soviet Union start this on the territory of Czechoslovakia and the GDR? In the statement by Yuriy Andropov, it is said that we were forced to do this. We cannot allow a superiority of the NATO bloc over us -- and the United States in this case. I have already said this increases the nuclear danger. The nuclear confrontation has increased. But who is to blame? Who started it all? That is the whole question.

I would like to add just a couple of words on this subject. The U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles are by no means targeted on the Soviet Union alone. They are also directed against the entire socialist community, including the GDR, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other countries belonging to the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

Therefore, when the leaders of the NATO countries discussed...[Ogarkov corrects himself] the Warsaw Treaty Organization discussed these measures of return, their collective decision spoke of measures of retaliation by the socialist countries, including the deployment of tactical missiles on the territory of Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic, to protect those countries from the threat posed by American missiles not only to Western Europe but to the countries of Eastern Europe too.

[Translator] Next question: The former head of the American delegation at the Geneva talks, Paul Nitze, when touring certain West European countries recently, claimed that the talks in Geneva had been broken off at a moment when there were signs of progress. Is this so? Asks a correspondent of Soviet television, Mnatsakanov.

[Korniyenko] No, this is not so. There was no progress at the talks in Geneva, and there could not have been in the situation that prevailed, in view of the non-constructive, unrealistic position adopted by the United States from the very first day of the talks to the last. Such claims are being made -- mildly speaking, unscrupulous claims -- with a very clear purpose in view. First to try to evade responsibility, to remove the responsibility of the United States for the breakdown of the talks and to create the false impression that the positions of the Soviet Union and the United States were drawing closer -- and in this way, to sow illusions for the future.

[Translator] Now your questions from the floor, please.

[Unidenfified questioner in English] The question of command and control...

[Second voice in English interrupting] Just a second, just a second; translation please.

[Voice of first questioner again] Now that the warning times will be down to about 8 minutes on missile firings, the question of command and control becomes even more important than it was when we had only 30 minutes warning time. My questions are these: Does in normal time only the general secretary of the Communist Party have the authority to order the launch of nuclear weapons? When the general secretary of the Communist Party is incapacitated, who below him has that authority? And in any case do field commanders have the authority in the Soviet Union to launch nuclear weapons?

[Translator] I would reply to this as follows: We have a corresponding system of military command which assures at any moment the defense of the territory of the Soviet Union from any surprise attack. And this is assured by a corresponding structure of the Soviet military organization, the Defense Council and other bodies concerned with defense. At the head of this is the chairman of the Defense Council, who is abreast of all the matters dealt with by the Council of Defense. Your question please?

[Mike Davidov] Mike Dadidov, of THE DAILY WORLD, USA, I want to quote here from an editorial of THE WASHINGTON POST which appeared on 14 November. The editorial was entitled: "Don't Defer Deployment" and it, I quote the following, it says the closing of the INF forum will make a splash, but it is not serious since it always is true that European systems had best be discussed in the broader context of the strategic arms reduction talks. The implication here of course is clear, that there is nothing to worry about since the arms discussions can take up the questions of the medium missiles and therefore there should be really no concern. Will you please comment on that?

[Translator] Deputy Foreign Minister Korniyenko is answering:

Yes, such questions are being asked and they imply that the talks on nuclear arms in Europe might be merged, that the INF talks might be merged with the talks on strategic missile systems. But first of all, today to speak of this would be pointless. One can unite something realistically existing and since the talks on nuclear systems, intermediate range nuclear missile systems have been torpedoed by the United States and are now non-existant, I repeat, there is no point in speaking of merging the two talks and of speaking at a single forum about all the problems that were within the province of these two separate talks. This is today pointless.

[Translator] A question from a military observer of the NOVOSTI press agency to Marshal Ogarkov. Could you give the range of the tactical missiles of extended range?

[Ogarkov] I understand this to refer to the missiles being deployed in the GDR and Czechoslovakia. Yes, it is a sufficient range to reach most of the positional areas where missiles are being deployed in Western Europe.

[Translator] A question from the floor please. Yes, your question. A question to Marshal Ogarkov. We understand that the possible step in reply to the Pershing deployment is the possibility to deploy Soviet cruise missiles on Soviet submarines off American shores. Will you do this soon? And could this lead to a crisis like the Cuban missile crisis of 1962? The question is being repeated.

[Ogarkov] In Yuriy Andropov's statement this was answered quite explicitly in the sense that in this case we are deploying proper Soviet systems in the oceans and seas adjacent to the territory of the United States, and these systems will have capabilities adequate to counter the threat posed by the deployment of American missiles in Europe, and let me repeat once again, adequate in range, in yield, in accuracy, and what is especially important, in flight time to their targets. As for the second part of your question, I understand it but it has no relevance to what Yuriy Andropov said. We must understand this as it was stated in that statement. I would like to add that the capabilities (?of) the Armed Forces are by no means exhausted by missiles alone.

There are other possibilities too, and therefore any attempt made to upset the existing European or general strategic balance would naturally incur other measures too, to assure the security of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. What other measures I am referring to, I don't think there is a need at the moment to spell them out.

[Translator] The next question from the floor please. Leo Wieland of the FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG, and he has a question to Marshal Ogarkov. Marshal Ogarkov, How would you explain to an Italian, a West German or other citizen of countries without such missiles the need for the Soviet Union to have missiles targeted on those countries? Can you explain this, the fear that will naturally arise in those countries and the need for such a counterweight?

[Ogarkov] When we speak of the possibility of retaliating to the deployment of the American missiles in Europe we are referring above all to those territories where these missiles are being deployed.

[Translator] Is there a further question?

[Wieland] I would like to formulate my question slightly differently. I was not referring to the reply measures of the Soviet Union. I was thinking of the years that passed since the Soviet Union began modernizing its SS-20 missiles, and the Federal Government repeatedly voiced its concern about this. Why then did the Soviet Union all these years consider it necessary to deploy missiles that were targeted on countries that did not have such weapons?

[Ogarkov] I have already explained that the deployment of SS-20 missiles has not altered the balance of intermediate-range nuclear missiles, and when we began deploying the SS-20 missiles we dismantled an even greater number of SS-4 and SS-5 missiles. This was a normal process of modernizing old missiles no longer suitable, replacing them with more modern missiles. The same personnel man them. The new missiles are naturally slightly superior to the old ones. The same process is taking place in other countries. Three generations have succeeded one another in missiles in France; in submarine missiles in Britain and France one generation is succeeding another.

The same is true of American missiles, Minuteman I, Minuteman II, Minuteman III. This is a natural process, but on the whole the total balance of -- the strategic balance in Europe did not change as a result of this, and in the number of warheads the West has an even greater number. But I am referring not just to warheads on missiles. That would be one-sided. I am also speaking of all the intermediate-range missile delivery systems. Therefore, modernization process does not create an entirely new situation.

I would like to remind the person who asked the question that Chancellor Schmidt as recently as February, on 18 February 1981, when asked bluntly by one of your colleagues in Federal Germany whether he considered that the balance of forces between the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO in nuclear arms was already upset or not -- Chancellor Schmidt clearly stated no, he did not consider this so and had never said so. He was merely speaking of the possibility of the balance being upset if the present trend continued. Now compare to that the statement of Chancellor Schmidt 2-3 months later when he applauded and supported the zero option of President Reagan whereby the Soviet Union would for some reason have to destroy all its missiles, not just those that existed in February 1981, but everything that had existed since 1960, whereas NATO would not dismantle a single intermediate-range nuclear delivery system.

Have a look at that. Look up text books of logic and tell me whether there is a single grain of common sense there. I would clearly state to your citizens that Soviet missiles are not targeted on the inhabitants of Holland, Italy or other countries mentioned by Helmut Schmidt. He said: How can I calmly look at Soviet missiles being targeted on my native Hamburg. And he was told in reply that there was not a single missile, Soviet missile targeted on Hamburg. Soviet missiles were installed in reply to the deployment of Soviet [as heard] forward-based systems which are targeted on Soviet cities, military centers, military objectives and other objectives that the Americans consider should be their strategic targets and now the targets of Pershings, which likewise for us become strategic systems directed against the Soviet Union. Our measures in response, previous ones and the present ones are aimed at countering those weapons that are spearheaded against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and it is wrong to say that Soviet missiles are targeted on Holland or Denmark, where there are no missiles and which do not threaten the Soviet Union.

The threat, moreover, is increasing in proportion to the number of American missiles being deployed in West European countries. It is not surprising that many cities are declaring themselves to be nuclear-free. That is a correct understanding of the question, and that is the way it is. And our measures of reply will be entirely adequate to the threatening steps taken by the United States in deploying its Pershing and cruise missiles in Western Europe.

[Translator] A question to Deputy Foreign Minister Korniyenko. That will be the fate of the INF talks, a question from the TASS correspondent, Vashedchenko.

[Korniyenko] The American missiles of intermediate range deployed in Europe, as has already been said here, become, as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, strategic weapons. Consequently, the fact that such missiles are now being deployed cannot but have a direct influence on the talks on strategic arms too. What will be these consequences it is too early to say. I would confine myself today to saying that the latest meeting at the talks on strategic arms, the next meeting will take place on 8 December. What its outcome will be will become known. You don't learn everything on the same day.

[Translator] A question from the (?Fuji) correspondent, Mr (Sona). Is there any hope that in the present situation now that the American missiles are being deployed in Europe the Soviet Union will accept a compromise on the British and French warheads and agree not to take them into account?

[Unidentified speaker] There is no such hope. We have spoken of this in detail. The British and French missiles, as we have said, are missiles of countries that belong to NATO. They are realistically existing missiles, and one cannot but ask: Who are they targeted against? Are they targeted on other NATO countries? Naturally not. Consequently, why should the Soviet Union not have a counter to these very specific deployed missiles? Why should the Soviet Union not take them into account? I think the answer to that question is so obvious that it can be misunderstood only by those who do not want to understand it.

[Translator] A question from the West German STERN Magazine, (Witzer): Leaving aside the authorship of variant 572, why did this variant not succeed? A second question, from the HANDELSBLATT correspondent, Peter (Seidlitz), Federal Germany: Chancellor Kohl claims that during the walk in the woods by Kvitsinskiy and Nitze they discussed a model of a mutual agreement. What is the official Soviet view on these unofficial talks?

[Unidentified speaker] As for the walks in the woods, I have already spoken of that and it is, of course, more pleasant to walk in the woods than to speak in a room where there has been much smoking. But I want to say definitely that in the woods, too, the head of the Soviet delegation adhered to the same position that has been set forth at official meetings. As for why the variant 572, as it's called, was not successful, well, you probably know the meaning of this variant; The United States would in that case have given up the deployment of all its missiles in Europe, 572 missiles, and the Soviet Union would have reduced its warheads, the warheads on its intermediate range missiles, by the same number, 572. But this is not just a figures game. This variant would have led the United States to give up the deployment of its missiles, but that was unacceptable to the United States, it wanted something else. It was not interested in how many missiles would be reduced by the Soviet side, how many warheads it would reduce, unless it was a reduction to zero. It couldn't care less how many warheads the Soviet Union would reduce. It was interested only in one thing, namely that it began deploying its missiles in Europe. That is the reason for the fate of variant 572.

[Translator] A question from the floor now. Swedish television has a question to Marshal Ogarkov. You said several times that Pershing missiles are strategic missiles. Why then is it not expedient to move the discussion on those missiles into the strategic arms talks?

[Ogarkov] There are now parallel talks on strategic missiles and on intermediate range nuclear missiles, the latter rather existed, they are no more. The result of the former talks, of the talks on intermediate range nuclear missiles is well known. They have been broken off, torpedoed to be more exact, by the United States. At the other talks matters are heading in the same direction and therefore to speak of the benefits or non-benefits of merging the two talks, merging the two problems, is wrong. What is needed is a change of approach to these talks, a change of approach by the American side.

[Translator] Is it possible that the Pershing missiles will at some later date be included in those talks?

[Ogarkov] Well, that's a hypothetical question; at any rate today.

[Translator] Next question from the floor, please. (Don Kimelman). I'm a correspondent with THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER. This is a question for Mr Zamyatin. I would like to return if I might to the matter of Mr Andropov's health. As you well know, he has not been seen in public...

[Translator interrupts] The next question is addressed to Mr Zamyatin and it concerns President Andropov's health. There is all sorts of speculation in the West about his health and it is believed he is seriously ill. Is he suffering only from a cold or not?

[Zamyatin] I cannot accept your insinuations because they do not correspond to the truth and everything I considered it necessary to state to you officially I have done so and that corresponds to the truth. As for insinuations spread by your journal, too, probably that is not relevant here.

[Translator] The next question from the Floor, please:

The media are informing us that Pershings may be installed elsewhere in other parts of the globe, too, namely in Israel. What is your attitude to that?

[Zamyatin] The more Pershings there are near the borders of the Soviet Union the worse the situation will be. There could be no other reply. Where they are proposed to be -- where they are to be deployed, that's a question you should address to the United States. Even the number already given, 572, for Pershings and cruise missiles has been sufficient, as you see, to radically heighten international tension. I would add that the Pershings deployed in Europe are targeted not only on the Soviet Union. They can also reach the Middle East and the Mediterranean area, and they create tension not only in Europe but elsewhere, too, in the Middle East and the Mediterranean for the umpteenth time, and our measures of reply accordingly are prompted and motivated not only by our security but also by consideration of the security of our friends and allies.

[Translator] A question from TRYBUNA LUDU, Poland, addressed to Marshal Ogarkov: What is, what will be, the position of the West European countries whose governments have agreed to deploy American missiles?

[Ogarkov] I think that it would be best to address that question to the governments of those countries which are turning their territory into launching pads for American missiles. For my part, I can say as a military man that the security of those countries will not be enhanced by those missiles, quite the contrary.

[Translator] There is a question from the representative of the Israeli communist press in Moscow, (Leon Zahavi): It has been officially announced that recently at a meeting in Washington, Reagan and Shamir decided to extend and deepen their strategic cooperation. The decision taken turns Israel into an official American military base, and the Israeli army into an army of American mercenaries. The recently coordinated American-Israeli air raids on Lebanon are the first signs of the plans agreed upon there. Would you comment on this?"

[Zamyatin] I have already commented on this and said that in the Soviet Union, this is seen as a bandit action directed at extending military intervention by the United States and Israel against Lebanon and against all the Arab countries that are supporting Lebanon.

[Translator] There is a similar question from the newspaper AL-BA'TH in Syria. The correspondent is (Dr Faridi).

[Zamyatin] That question is covered by the answer I have just given about the Middle East.

[Translator] Now a question from the floor. [Words indistinct] WASHINGTON POST. May I address the question to Marshal Ogarkov about the Middle East? I am not a military man but I've heard that the situation has become worse. Mr Zamyatin said that its a dangerous situation in the Middle East. Yesterday two American planes were shot down by the Syrian forces, eight [as heard] American soldiers perished. Since the U.S. forces and the American and Soviet forces are close in that area: How do you evaluate the situation today, since both American and Soviet forces are close in that area?

[Ogarkov] I think to say in which direction the situation is developing is no sense. It think it's obvious. You are right that yesterday 24 [as heard] American planes and 8 Israeli planes attacked the national patriotic forces in the mountainous area of Lebanon and attacked the Syrian forces in this area. The antiaircraft forces shot down two American planes and two pilots were captured by the Syrians.

America has tried to explain away these actions, but it has no grounds whatsoever for this. It was not the Syrians who started shelling the Americans, it was the American planes that flew to the area where the Syrians are located and attacked them. I think it would be better if the situation was defused. America has no reason whatsoever to send its forces thousands of miles away and to send tens of naval ships there. At present, there are 35 naval ships off the shores of Lebanon and about 2,000 infrantrymen. And then you stick labels on to them saying that someone is threatening these 2,000 soldiers. I think the example of Grenada should be very indicative. Who threatens who?

[Translator] A question to Comrade Korniyenko: Can you say that the next meeting between the USSR and the United States on disarmament will take place in January in Stockholm? Will the USSR pose any preliminary conditions for such a meeting? And an analogous question from (Helmut Weinand), correspondent of UNSERE ZEIT of the Federal Republic: Since there was a false interpretation of Yuriy Andropov's letter, including Chancellor Kohl, about the continuation of the talks in Geneva, now there is speculation on the conference in Stockholm. With what conception will the USSR enter these talks?

[Korniyenko] As for the possibility or no possibility about Soviet-American talks in Stockholm, you know, I suppose, that there is no agreement on opening the Stockholm conference on the level of foreign ministers; [it] does not as yet exist. Therefore, it would be premature to speak about the possibility of the nonexistence of a possibility of meeting of foreign ministers of the Soviet Union and the United States. As for what conception we will go to the conference: Is it a conference or is it a bilateral meeting in Stockholm? If it's a bilateral meeting, with what conception will we go to a conference, that's one thing. I can say this, today, that there'll be a constructive, a good, conception with which we will come to these talks. But I would also like to note that politically it would be naive to think that the situation, the new situation, which has arisen in Europe in connection with the deployment of American missiles -- this cannot but have a negative effect on the work of this forum, too.

[Translator] Your question?, OBSERVER of England: I have two questions to Marshal Ogarkov. In Moscow it is usually said that the cruise missiles are a first-strike weapon; taking into consideration these rockets have a limited speed, how can they be first strike weapons? Second question: And now the SS-20 rockets; was there an intention of the Soviet Union to deploy that many SS-20's as in the past? Before them, there were SS-4 and SS-5, was there an intention to deploy an equal number of SS-20's as SS-4's and SS-5's?

[Ogarkov] Two questions, as far as I understand. Now, if you take the Pershings and the cruise they have, you say, limited speed. Yes, they can be compared. If such rockets, cruise rockets, I mean, with a longer range were deployed on the territory of the United States they could not be taken into consideration, but they will be deployed, and are being deployed, in the immediate vicinity of the Soviet borders and the socialist countries. These rockets fly at a height of only 50 meters. Therefore the radio location and radars can only see them, so to say, when they approach our borders. Therefore, the time in apprehending is very short indeed, although their speed is slow. But it does not give the time to the radar means to apprehend them. Then the system of directing them is such that they can hit a target within 50 meters. They can very exactly strike at the targets which are assigned to them. That, totally, is what determines their role and their ability -- and the ability to use them, together with Pershing IIs, as first-strike weapons. And that is what the United States wants to use them as.

As for the number of SS-20s that we wanted to deploy, I think this question was answered in detail by Yuriy Andropov. I will allow myself to quote him. He said that the reply measure will be within the limits of the actions taken by the NATO countries. Our reply actions will be determined by the actions of NATO.

[Translator] A question of Marshal Ogarkov. Can you -- NEWSWEEK -- can you say how many rockets and what kind does the USSR plan to deploy in answer to NATO's rockets? Do you -- do you want the West to guess?

[Ogarkov] I just answered that all this will be determined by the actions of the United States and the countries of NATO. You (?can try the same) with another rendition, which I think you understand -- that the Soviet Union, some may think, already planned the deployment of these rockets. That is incorrect. That is falsifying or trying to hoodwink public opinion. The actions of the Soviet Union are determined by the fact that the United States is deploying its rockets in Europe. Were there no American rockets in Europe, there would be no Soviet rockets and no Soviet countermeasures. Which rockets -- what -- which -- what the actions of the United States and NATO will be in Europe will determine our countermeasures.

[Translator] There is a question from the correspondent of IZVESTIYA Bandura. In the West it is sometimes said that the Soviet Union planned this beforehand, irrespective of the deployment by America of the missiles. Why should such things be said in the West?

[Ogarkov] I have just answered this, that they want to fool public opinion.

[Translator] Bulgarian radio: Won't the first-strike doctrine and the blitzkrieg doctrine of HItler be repeated again?

[Unidentified speaker] You can make such a analogy. In their times the Hitlerites, drunk with their early victories, felt they could win a blitzkrieg, and they feft this was something real. But life truly overthrew such doctrines. Any hopes for a disarming, preemptive strike are just as empty and without foundation as the plans of the Nazis for a blitzkrieg. Let me say that the Soviet Union, as has been stressed in the statement by Yuriy Andropov, stands on the position of cutting down all nuclear arsenals. Unlike Mr Kohl who thinks that a nuclear threat is the best guarantee of forestalling a war, preventing a war, the Soviet Union thinks that the less nuclear arsenals both sides have, the more hopes there are of maintaining peace. Therefore, we are for a radical cut of nuclear arsenals. If you would speak about Europe, we are ready to completely do away with the nuclear arsenals in Europe, both medium-range and tactical weapons. We want to free Europe of weapons, so we would not be a powderkeg, which is very dangerous today. The nuclear arms are not toys.

[Translator] Another question from the floor and we'll be ending our press conference on this (?day). First question, please. Two more questions from the floor. Austrian television. I would like to draw your attention to the graph, to the picture on the walls. (?Then) Austrian television. A question addressed to Marshal Ogarkov. It's about cruise missiles and the neutral countries. We don't have this note of yours, (?to) read your question. On the basis of agreement, Austria cannot have its missiles. Will the Soviet Union be ready in connection with the deployment of cruise missiles in Western Europe to change the agreement so that the Austrian Army could have its cruise missiles?

[Korniyenko] Since the question concerns an agreement, let me answer this. The problem today, I think, is we have a common aim, a common goal not to allow a situation where the process started by the deployment by American nuclear missiles in Europe [corrects himself] We want to change this process, to turn it around, to stop this process and not to start reviewing the agreements signed, and the agreement signed with Austria in particular. We want to stop the process of deployment. This agreement, I don't think, has any direct connection with the problem.

[Translator] Another question please from the floor. TIME magazine. To Marshal Ogarkov. Millions of Americans saw on television a film called The Day After. There's a big discussion in the United States about this film. Don't you think, do you think, the Soviet Union could live through a nuclear war?

[Ogarkov] I saw this film and I think the danger which has been shown in this film is a really existing danger if the strategists that are, their plans are, transmitted [words indistinct].

Decide for yourself. At present, among the strategic armed forces, in one launch, 12,000 warheads could be used in one launch with a total power of 3,400 megatons. This is 170,000 times greater in power than the first atomic bomb that was dropped in 1945 on Hiroshima, 170,000 times more powerful. Just think of that. And this is only -- I'm speaking only of strategic nuclear forces. But if we take all -- the whole arsenals of nuclear forces of the United States and NATO -- this will grow several times.

But that's only one side of the question. If you add to this a retaliatory blow by the Soviet Union, which has, you must understand, no less power, then you see -- I don't think any commentaries are necessary. We have reached a limit which says that a stop must be put to nuclear madness. It becomes not only senseless but is very, very dangerous. And the fact that this film makes people think, seriously think -- and not only think but act to stop such lovers of military adventures -- I think this film in that respect is useful.

The last question is from Czechoslovakia. (?A correspondent from) Czechoslovakia. How does the Soviet Union consider the problem of nuclear weapons in Europe in the future?

[Unidentified speaker] In his statement of 24 November, Yuriy Andropov stated that if the United States and other countries show a readiness to return to the situation which existed before the deployment of the American forces, of rocket missiles in Europe, then the former suggestions, proposals, made by the Soviet Union will again come into force -- the Soviet proposals on nuclear weapons in Europe. Only if the former situation is restored. And then the unilateral obligations of the Soviet Union will also come into force. Yuriy Andropov reminded you that the Soviet Union, as before, stresses its suggestion and repeats its proposal to make Europe free from nuclear arms, both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons, to free Europe of both. The statement also stressed that in principle the Soviet Union is convinced that peace can be strengthened and the security of the nations guaranteed not through inventing ever-new armaments but by cutting the existing arms to much lower levels. And it was stated that to save mankind from the danger, can only human wisdom and the human brain and human thinking [sentence as heard] Commonsense will gain the upper hand, although for some, [they] need to take a cold shower in order to come to their senses.

[Translator] Ladies and gentlemen, allow me to thank you for participating in the press conference. And on [rephrases] with this, we are ending our press conference. Thank you.

TASS PROVIDES 'TEXT' OF QUESTIONS, ANSWERS

LD051638 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow December 5 TASS -- Follows the full text of the account of the answers to questions at the press conference held here. The press conference was attended by: the first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR Georgiy Korniyenko, chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces -- First Deputy Minister of Defence of the USSR, Marshal of the Soviet Union Nikolay Ogarkov, chief of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee Leonid Zamyatin.

Question. The leaders of the NATO countries allete that it was the Soviet SS-20 missiles that became the source of the critical situation in Europe. What can be said on this score?

Answer. Such allegations do not correspond to reality. The Soviet SS-20 missiles did not change the rough parity of forces in Europe and did not create a critical situation. The fact is that for each two new SS-20 missiles emplaced, the USSR at the same time dismantled three SS-4 and SS-5 missiles. Before the commencement of the deployment of the SS-20's, we had about 600 missiles in the West, and now only 473. Besides, the warhead capacity of SS-4 and SS-5 missiles is superior to that of SS-20's. That is why the aggregate capacity of all the warheads was reduced over this period by almost 50 percent, or 41.2 percent (by a factor of 1.7) to be more exact. This is well known, but for some reason they persistently keep silent on that in the West. With respect to the nuclear warheads on missiles, it is true, we are ahead of NATO, but as regards the total quantity of warheads on all the medium-range carriers NATO is superior to us about one and a half times even today.

That is why the critical situation on the European Continent is created not by the SS-20's but by the new U.S. medium-range missiles which sharply change the strategic situation and increase the danger.

Question: The FRG chancellor Helmut Kohl asserts that deployment of the U.S. missiles in the FRG will safeguard that country's security. What can you say on this?

Answer: In fact, the FRG chancellor recently said that "nuclear deterrence is the most reliable guarantee of preventing war". According to this logic, the more nuclear weapons the Western side has, the more secure the peace. For the leader of a country from whose territory two world wars have been unleashed in the twentieth century and which itself suffered their consequences, such rationalizations are more than strange and even dangerous.

The U.S. missiles deployed in the FRG, do, of course, increase the danger for the USSR and the countries of the socialist community. But at the same time they will sharply increase the nuclear threat for the FRG. The fact is that its territory is being transformed into a launching pad for missiles. And as such it will find itself in the position of a target for an immediate response strike. Shortsightedness in politics leads to no good.

Question: Why did the Soviet Union state that it would not return to the talks with the United States in Geneva until the "Pershing-2" and cruise missiles have been withdrawn? In adopting this position, the Soviet Union undermines its reputation in the West as a serious partner in negotiations.

Answer: We thank the gentlemen from the West for their concern for our reputation, but, frankly speaking, we have no need for such a concern. What we have precisely stated here has been spoken about in sufficient detail. As regards, however, the reputation of a serious partner in negotiations, it is the American side that has not only undermined but long ago forfeited its reputation, since it demonstrated from the very outset that it does not want an agreement and that it needs the talks only as a screen to hide preparations to implement its plans. To continue the talks in these conditions, when the USA has embarked on deploying its missiles, would amount to assisting in deceiving the world public. And we have no intention to engage in that.

Question: FRG Chancellor Kohl continues to assert that in Yuriy Andropov's message that he received there was a hint at the USSR's readiness to come back to the Geneva negotiations, that were interrupted. What is the matter here?

Answer: Really, Chancellor Kohl is harping on his own. To prove his interpretation he cites only one phrase from the message, which runs that the Soviet Union would not like to consider the situation that developed as irreversible.

Well, first, one should have a wealth of imagination to interpret that phrase in a way Chancellor Kohl does.

Second, no less astonishing is that in reply to direct questions of journalists whether the above mentioned wording in the message is accompanied by some explanations, the chancellor answers "no" and calls the wording as "final."

Considering such distortions and to make the whole question absolutely clear I shall cite the full the message's concluding paragraph, as it is:

"We, however, would not like to consider the obtaining situation to be irreversible. If a different, realistic approach to questions of security prevails in the West, if the NATO countries display the readiness to come back to the situation that existed before the beginning of deployment of American missiles in Europe, this, you may rest assured, would find a proper response from our side".

It appears that it is needless to make any more comment here.

Question: By way of one of the counter measures in connection with the commenced deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe the Soviet Union has announced that it relinquishes the obligations it assumed unilaterally. Does the same go for the Soviet pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons?

Answer: No. It does not. The Soviet Union has made its pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons outside the framework of the Geneva negotiations, and it remains in force.

Question: What is the purpose of the deployment of enhanced-range operational-tactical missiles on the territories of the GDR and CSSR, if the USSR, having lifted the moratorium, has begun to station its SS-20 missiles in the European part of the country?

Answer: The purpose of the siting of Soviet enhanced-range operational-tactical missiles on the territories of the GDR and CSSR is to neutralise the advantage which the USA hopes to achieve due to a short flight time of Pershing-2 missiles.

Question: How do you evaluate the latest events in the Middle East in the wake of a U.S. Air Force raid on the positions of Syrian troops in Lebanon?

Answer: What is happening in Lebanon now when U.S. Air Force backed by U.S. naval ships is firing at foreign, Lebanese, territory, and at the positions of the troops which are staying there on a legitimate basis, representing the inter-Arab force, is a fresh instance of banditry and aggression perpetrated for more than a year now by Israeli troops with the support of U.S. Armed Forces.

In justifying the raid of 28 U.S. bombers on the positions of Syrian troops stationed on Lebanese territory, the U.S. President declares that the United States is allegedly protecting U.S. Marines.

It is appropriate to ask: Who invited them there? It is common knowledge that they are staying there in addition to the Israeli troops who are trampling upon Lebanese soil in contravention of the United Nations Charter. The case in point is the expanding U.S. armed intervention in Lebanese. This is precisely how we regard a new U.S. act of aggression against the Syrian Armed Forces staying on Lebanese territory. We condemn this act of aggression, it is a source of indignation to the entire Soviet public. Our support and sympathies go out to the Arab peoples fighting the aggressor which has invaded their territory -- the Israeli aggressor and the American aggressor.

This is how we evaluate the latest events in that region, (we) condemn the actions of the USA and Israel, and will give support and aid to those who are countering aggression in that region.

Question: Paul Nitze, former head of the U.S. delegation to the Geneva talks, who is now touring Europe, claims that the talks were broken off just at the time when progress was in the offing at them. Is this really so?

Answer: No, it is not. There was no progress at the talks, nor could there be any given the non-constructive and unrealistic stand of the United States from the first day of the talks to the last. Such dishonest allegations, to put it mildly, are being spread with quite definite purposes, namely first, to try and absolve the United States of responsibility for the collapse of the talks and, second, to create the false impression about the presumed narrowing of the gap between the positions of the USA and the USSR, thus breeding illusions for the future as well.

Question: Can you say how Yuriy Andropov's health is?

Answer: As Yuriy Andropov recently said it in his reply letter to the leaders of the movement of physicians for peace, he could not meet them because of a cold. At present Yuriy Andropov is recovering. He concerns himself in full with party and state affairs, including matters which are the responsibility of the Defence Council of the USSR.

Question: What will be the fate of the Geneva talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms?

Answer: U.S. medium-range missiles installed in Europe will become strategic weapons with regard to the USSR. Hence, the fact that the deployment of those missiles has begun cannot fail to have an effect on the strategic arms talks. It is yet early to say what these consequences may be. We can only point out today that the last meeting of the delegations in the present round of the talks will take place on December 8, but as to what the outcome will be -- wait a little, you will soon know.

Question: What is the range of the Soviet Union's new operational-tactical systems deployed in the territories of the GDR and Czechoslovakia?

Answer: It is sufficient to reach most of the deployment areas of the U.S. missiles being installed in West European countries.

Question: One possible response to the deployment of Pershings in Europe will most probably be the deployment of Soviet submarine-launched cruise missiles off the U.S. shores. How soon is the Soviet Union going to do this and will not this step lead to the developments similar to the "Cuban crisis" of the early 1960's?

Answer: It follows from Yuriy Andropov's statement that in the point in case is the deployment of appropriate Soviet systems in the ocean areas and seas adjacent to the territory of the United States of America which from the point of view of their characteristics will be adequate to the threat created to our allies and us by the U.S. missiles deployed in Europe. [sentence as received] I will clarify again, adequate from the point of view of range, yield, accuracy and, which is particularly important, flight time to target.

I would like to add that the possibilities of our Armed Forces are far from limited to missiles alone. That is why in response to any action aimed at tipping the existing European and overall strategic balance, other measures will naturally be taken to ensure the security of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. I don't think it possible to specify those measures.

As for the second part of the question, it has no relationship to the measures in response described in Yuriy Andropov's statement.

Question: How can it be explained to a German, Dutchman, Italian, that is to Western Europeans, people in countries that do not possess nuclear weapons, why is it that the Soviet Union needs modern missiles of the SS-20 type aimed at targets in their countries?

Answer: When we speak about the possibility of reply actions to the deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe we bear in mind first of all those areas where these U.S. missiles will be deployed.

Question: They in the West try to treat the Soviet Union's reply measures as allegedly planned in advance and unconnected with the deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe. What is the meaning of such assertions? Can you say how many missiles and what types of missiles the Soviet Union plans to deploy in answer to the NATO missile deployment?

Answer: The reply measures by the USSR have an enforced nature. They have not been planned in advance and are connected only with the appearance of new U.S. missiles in Europe. If there were no "Pershings" and cruise missiles of the United States in Europe there would be no countermeasures by the Soviet Union. This is declared absolutely clearly in Yuriy Andropov's statement. As the United States and the NATO countries will act in Europe, so the Soviet Union will act in reply and on the same scale.

I would like to stress once again that the Soviet Union is firmly in favour of reduction of nuclear arsenals. Unlike those who assert that nuclear deterrence is the best guarantee of preventing war, the Soviet Union holds that the lesser the nuclear arsenals of the sides the greater the hope for preserving peace. Therefore we declare for radical reduction of nuclear armaments. As far as Europe is concerned, we are fully prepared to liquidate both medium-range and tactical nuclear armaments in Europe.

Question: Recently millions of Americans watched a television film about what the next day after a nuclear war would be like. This is a subject much spoken about in the United States. Has Marshal Ogarkov seen this film?

Answer: Yes, I have, and I think that the danger which is shown in the film really exists. Judge for yourself. The strategic nuclear forces of the USA can fire in one salvo and one launching 12,000 warheads with a total yield of 3,400 megatons. This is 170,000 times more than the yield of the first atomic bomb the Americans brought down on Hiroshima in 1945! 170,000 times! Just think of it.

And this goes for the strategic nuclear forces only. And if we add to this the entire stockpile of the nuclear forces of the United States of America and other NATO countries, the figure will grow several times. However, this still is only one aspect. If we add to this the nuclear systems of the other side, it won't take much to realise that the world has reached the limit when it is high time to put an end to nuclear madness.

Question: Is there any hope that now, in the existing situation, when U.S. missiles are being set up in Europe, the USSR will agree to a compromise on the issue of British and French warheads and consent not to take them into account?

Answer: No, it is impossible not to take them into account.

Question: The mass media bring us to the news about possibility of stationing Pershings not only in Europe but in other parts of the world as well, specifically, the case in point is the delivery of U.S. Pershings to Israel.

Answer: The "Pershings" deployed in Europe are trained not only on the socialist countries. They can also reach the region of the Mediterrean and the Middle East. In creating tension in Europe, the United States is also creating it in the region of the Middle East and the Mediterranean. Our response measures are thus a demonstration of concern not only for our security but also for the security of allies and our friends.

Question: How does the Soviet Union visualize eventually resolving the problems of nuclear arms in Europe?

Answer: In his statement, Yuriy Andropov pointed out that if the USA and other countries display readiness to return to the situation that existed prior to the commencement of the deployment of U.S. missiles, then the proposals previously submitted by the Soviet Union on questions of nuclear arms limitations and reductions in Europe will regain their validity. In this case, i.e. on condition that the pre-existing situation has been restored, the Soviet Union's unilateral commitments in this field would also resume their validity.

The statement reminded that the Soviet Union reaffirms its proposal that Europe be made totally free from nuclear weapons -- both medium-range and tactical. The Soviet Union is in principle convinced that peace can be strengthened and the security of the people guaranteed not through the build-up and invention of increasingly new types of weapons, but, on the contrary, through reduction of the existing armaments to immeasurably lower levels. Only human reason, Yuriy Andropov stressed, can and must save mankind from the formidable threat.

We believe in human reason, and believe that common sense will eventually prevail.

The participants in the press conference also answered a number of other questions.

COMPARISON OF FOREIGN MINISTRY PRESS CONFERENCE

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 6 December carries in its First Edition on page 4 a TASS report under the heading "Press Conference in Moscow" which reproduces in a single item a portion of the Moscow World Service in English version that begins on page AA 1 above followed by the Moscow TASS in English "Text" of the Question and Answer session that begins on page AA 18. The PRAVDA report has been compared with the above two versions, revealing the following variations:

Page AA 1 first paragraph, line one, PRAVDA begins... A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists was held in Moscow on 5 December. Taking part were Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov, chief of General Staff of the Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defense minister; G.M. Korniyenko, USSR first deputy foreign minister; and L.M. Zamyatin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Information Department.

Opening the press conference, L.M. Zamyatin said:

Today's press conference is devoted... (supplying alternative opening passage, picking up first paragraph line one);

Second paragraph line three PRAVDA reads... new American missiles. G.M. Korniyenko, who addressed the press conference, said: By beginning the... (rephrasing, picking up third paragraph line one);

Third paragraph antepenultimate line PRAVDA reads... deadlock the talks and begin as soon as possible deploying its missiles... (changing word order);

Page AA 2, first paragraph, line eighteen PRAVDA omits... highly...;

First paragraph, last line PRAVDA reads... get you far.

Then Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov spoke. (rewording second paragraph);

Third paragraph, line one PRAVDA omits... [Ogarkov] Gentlemen, comrades...;

Penultimate paragraph, line four, PRAVDA omits... 10 percent more...;

Page AA 3, first paragraph, line three, PRAVDA omits... 62 on each side...;

First paragraph, line four, PRAVDA reads... be reduced in Europe and to reduce... (subbing "Europe" for "the West");

Third paragraph, line two PRAVDA reads... missiles, keeping only 465 aircraft, whereas the... (supplying figure);

Third paragraph, line four PRAVDA reads... launch vehicles and an almost triple superiority in... (supplying "almost");

Last paragraph, line two PRAVDA reads... their proposals? Unquestionably! Today we have... (omitting phrase);

Last paragraph, line four, PRAVDA omits... did not want, I repeat...;

Page AA 4, first paragraph, line eight, PRAVDA reads...it would like come what may to give it strategic nuclear forces the capability to inflict a so-called "disarming" nuclear strike, that... (adding elements);

Second paragraph, line three PRAVDA reads...for launching them, with widely developed multiple back-up systems of controlling... (picking up line five, rewording);

Fifth paragraph, last line PRAVDA reads...and preserve peace. Then the press conference participants answered questions from the correspondents... (supplying additional sentence);

Here the PRAVDA report omits the remainder of the Moscow World Service in English version and adds the Moscow TASS in English version of the questions and answers, except for the following variations:

Page AA 18, PRAVDA omits entire first paragraph from..."Moscow December 5" through "Leonid Zamyatin";

Third paragraph, line eight PRAVDA omits...or 41.2 percent...;

Page AA 20, fourth paragraph, line five PRAVDA has "Lebanon" instead of "Lebanese";

Page AA 21, fourth paragraph, line one, PRAVDA reads...Andropov's statement that the case in point is the deployment... (rewording);

Last paragraph, PRAVDA omits entire fifth paragraph from..."I would like" through "armaments in Europe";

Page AA 22, PRAVDA omits entire third paragraph from "And this goes" through "to nuclear "madness."

'SOVIET SOURCE' CITED ON ARMS TALKS PROSPECTS

PM051130 Paris LE FIGARO in French 1 Dec 83 p 3

[Charles Lambroschini dispatch: "Euromissiles: Moscow Blows Hot and Cold"]

[Text] Moscow -- Is the USSR now merely waiting for the best opportunity to resume the Euromissile negotiations? Or on the other hand, is it going to bide its time until the U.S. elections in 11 months' time in the hope that Ronald Reagan will disappear from the scene?

The following short utterance from a Soviet source that "the Stockholm meeting on 17 January could provide a good therometer" seems to correspond to the former interpretation. The Conference on Disarmament in Europe, which will bring together 35 nations, may make it possible to determine "whether the West is ready to try to ease the atmosphere between the two blocs." Following the Madrid debates on security and cooperation which ended in September, the Stockholm meeting threatens a very long wait for any concrete results. Observers who cite as a precedent the Vienna talks on the reduction of conventional forces, which have been in progress for 10 years, foresee a minimum of 3 years before the conclusion of the initial chapter: namely, an agreement on "confidence-building measures."

The following comment that has been made to us is equally interesting. Rather than providing an opportunity for the West to make amends by recognizing that when faced with the fait accompli of the deployment of the Pershing and cruise missiles the Soviets could do nothing but break off the talks, the Stockholm conference may give the Kremlin an excuse to justify resuming missile trading.

This is the Soviet reasoning: The split in Geneva took place for reasons which went far beyond technical differences regarding launchers and nuclear warheads. The conflict between the two great powers is a fundamental one: Washington and Moscow have different ideas of the "code" of international relations. "It is pointless negotiating if the atmosphere is one of distrust and total hostility."

The objective is clear: The problem must be taken up again at a "higher level." The beginning, therefore, must be to agree on a definition of security. The corollary to that is that the discussion cannot be restricted to the European theater alone. A global consensus is needed. Moreover, the Williamsburg economic summit last June confirmed that implicitly when the seven Western countries participating in it proclaimed the indivisibility of security between NATO and Japan. The point underlying the goals but expressed also explains why the Soviets do not accept the compromise plan outlined by the Americans of "merging" the two sets of negotiations on tactical weapons and strategic weapons. "It will take more than a mere gimmick to change a general attitude."

The way to reach the goal is more subtle. Since Reagan is blinded by his anticommunist crusade why not overcome the obstacle by leaving things to the Europeans? "Instead of repeating someone else's phrase all the time it will be up to them to think up their own phrase."

A Policy of Pessimism

Even if for the moment Reagan's reelection seems assured, it is understandable that the Soviet leaders are not ruling out the pleasant surprise of his defeat. Those people in Moscow who have contact with Western journalists and diplomats continually stress that a U.S. election is never settled in advance. "It is all decided in the 3 months before the voting." There could be a massacre of U.S. soldiers in Central America or the Near East which threatens overnight to transform Reagan the hero into Reagan the dangerous warmonger. The persistence of high interest rates may overturn the recovery and launch unemployment again toward a politically fatal level.

This context would rule out the Soviets' choice of electioneering. That is, a gamble on the fact that Reagan, in need of a diplomatic success before the election, may appear more inclined toward making concessions. It is best to do nothing that might help the outgoing President. Furthermore, "appeasing Reagan is no guarantee that he will not play a dirty trick on us. On the contrary, a favorable outcome in Geneva will perhaps encourage him to pounce in Nicaragua."

Both hypotheses are plausible. But the policy of pessimism has its limits. The Soviets are letting it be known that they will not hesitate to "stonewall" until the end of a second term at the White House. "We will tolerate Reagan. We will not give way to him." All the same, it is hard to imagine the Kremlin clinging to a policy of "stonewalling" for 5 years. Since, unlike the successful operation with the neutron bomb in 1977, the pressure exerted by manipulated European public opinion has not been enough to block the deployment of the U.S. missiles. The Soviets have no way out. They can no longer prevent the installation of the Pershings. They can still negotiate over the reductions of the total number of missiles.

The history of Euromissile deals provides a complementary indicator. When NATO announced its two-track decision (deployment and negotiation) in Brussels on 12 December 1979, the Soviets immediately replied: "The very basis of possible discussions has been destroyed." Moscow explained that the USSR would agree to negotiate only if the Atlantic alliance "suspended" its intention to deploy.

Just as now the Soviets are declaring that the reestablihsment of the status quo must be the precondition for their return to Geneva. The status quo in this case means the sending back of the U.S. missiles. As long ago as July 1980 the Kremlin accepted the principle of opening a conference in Geneva. Why should this example not be repeated?

A warning here: The same Soviet source who is making so much of the 17 January Stockholm meeting immediately added the rider: "We do not have too many illusions. Stockholm leaves us skeptical." The old hot and cold tactic again. He added: "In a war of nerves the West always loses..."

REAGAN URGED TO 'SAVE MANKIND' FROM DESTRUCTION

LD021352 Moscow TASS in English 1256 GMT 2 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow December 2 TASS -- TASS news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov writes:

Having gone ahead with the deployment of "Pershing-2" and cruise missiles in Western Europe, the Reagan administration has initiated a qualitatively new and very dangerous round of the nuclear arms race. Introducing those missles in a number of NATO countries, Washington is planning drastically to tip in its favour the rough parity of military forces existing in Europe. The Pentagon is now going to compound that reckless step with another chip in the adventuristic policy from strength. The British FINANCIAL TIMES reports today that the NATO countries' defense ministries will discuss at a meeting next week 30 potentially new weapons systems. Washington, according to the newspaper, would like the meeting to approve that large-scale military buildup programme.

The United States is thus imposing on its NATO allies another burden of the arms race, fraught with grave military-political and economic consequences.

The Soviet Union is opposed in principle to competition in the production and stock-piling of weapons of mass destruction. It believes that mankind has too many pressing tasks which cannot be accomplished only because of the diversion of colossal material and other resources for the arms race.

The Soviet Union, Yuriy Andropov said in his statement of November 24, is convinced that peace can be strengthened and the security of the peoples guaranteed not through an arms buildup and the development of ever new weapons systems but, conversely, through the reduction in the existing armaments to incomparably lower levels.

It is this idea that pervades all the Soviet initiatives at the Geneva talks.

The USSR is prepared to reach agreement on the complete removal of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical ones, from Europe. If the West is not ready for such a dramatic step, the USSR suggested that agreement be reached on a major stage-by-stage reduction in medium-range nuclear systems, scaling them down to less than one-third of the present potentials. The Soviet Union stated furthermore that it did not want to have in Europe a single missile or a single plane more than NATO had. The USSR called for equality of nuclear potentials in Europe both in terms of delivery vehicles and in terms of warheads. Washington, however, disregarded all those constructive proposals and set out to turn Western Europe into an American proving ground for nuclear missiles. European security has thus been faced with mortal danger.

The Soviet leadership calls upon those who are pushing the world towards an ever more dangerous arms race to give up their futile hope to achieve military superiority in that way. Reagan can and must save mankind from a formidable danger.

WEST'S 'ILLUSION' ON USSR RETURN TO INF SCORED

LD051141 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] A telegram from Paris reports that U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger, delivering a report at the Atlantic Institute of International Relations, asserted that the USSR will supposedly soon return to the Geneva negotiations on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe. Viktor Levin comments on this report:

[Levin] An abundance of such statements is being made not only by the Americans, but also by West European politicians who have supported the deployment of Pershing II and Tomahawk missiles on the territory of their countries. The impression may be created that many responsible political figures in the West are either unable to read or unable to understand what they read. Comrade Andropov's of 24 November statement makes the USSR's position as clear as possible. It says plainly that the decisions made by the governments of the FRG, Britain and Italy make it unambiguously clear that in defiance of the wishes of their own peoples, in defiance of the interests of the security of their countries ad the interest of European and world peace, these governments have given the green light to the deployment of U.S. missiles.

By the same token, Comrade Andropov's statement stresses, they have assumed together with the U.S. Government full responsibility for the consequences of the short-sighted policy, about which the USSR gave prior warning.

The actions of the West rendered impossible the continuation of the negotiations that were being conducted in Geneva on nuclear weapons in Europe, and this is understood not only in the USSR and other socialist countries but also in those states that by the will of their own governments have found themselves in the position of nuclear hostages of the United States.

In order for the talks to be resumed it is essential to return to the position that existed before the beginning of deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe. The USSR unambiguously declares its readiness to do this. But in the West, as the statements of prominent political figures testify, they will not even hear of this. So why do these same figures so stubbornly disseminate illusions about the USSR's speedy return to the Geneva talks?

This is explained by the fact that their adventurist, militarist policy is encountering growing opposition from broad circles of the public. Calculations to the effect that with the beginning of missile deployement the antiwar movement would subside have not been justified. Furthermore, the scope of that movement is continually widening. Evidence of this is the international week of action against Pershing II and cruise missiles.

In these circumstances the governments of the West European states clearly feel ill at ease [ne v svoyey tarelke] as they say, and are no doubt expressing their dissatisfaction to their transatlantic partner.

In Washington too it is understood that straightforward action is fraught with danger. The WALL STREET JOURNAL, which is influential in the United States, recently wrote that the U.S. Administration is trying to avoid a crisis atmosphere which could provoke the U.S. allies to demand that the United States demonstrate a new initiative aimed at bringing the Russians back to the negotiating table.

And here, no doubt, the fear that the antimissile movement will exert an influence, undesirable to Washington, on the governments of Bonn, London, and Rome plays a part.

Hence the efforts to create the impression that the USSR will accept the deployment of U.S. missiles. Let us say clearly that these efforts are in vain.

EXPENDITURES ON NEW ARMS RACE ROUND DECRIED

LD031556 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 3 Dec 83

[From The Vremya newscast; IZVESTIYA political observer Aleksandr Bovin video talk]

[Text] Good day comrades. Ten days ago we heard Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's statement. Throughout the 10 days since then this most important document has been the focus of attention of Soviet and world public opinion and responsible political circles worldwide. Various opinions have been, and are being, expressed. The watershed here is obvious. Those who support NATO's two-track decision and Washington's militaristic course naturally reject both our logic and our position. But those who realize the danger of the new wave of militarism, who understand the true meaning of U.S. policy, naturally also understand the need and inevitability of the decisions announced by Yuriy Vladimirovich.

If one is to speak about the principle, fundamental meaning of the statement, I would put it this way: Under no circumstances will the Soviet Union ever allow the approximate balance of forces to be upset or broken, whether one is speaking of the global, strategic equation or of parity at the Eurostrategic level. This, I repeat, is the main thing -- hence, the specific measures mentioned in Comrade Andropov's statement. Of course, these are not easy decisions. We all realize that new arms mean additional expenditure of resources -- human, material, and financial resources. And, after all, we have other problems that have to be resolved and that we want to resolve. But nothing can be resolved without peace. That is why the state's security interests and the preservation of peace are more important than anything else. And those thousands and thousands of meetings that have been held throughout the country are a kind of nationwide referendum supporting the decisions taken by our leadership.

These are difficult and alarming times. From each of us they demand more self-discipline and more commitment. Ultimately our might, and therefore our security, are the outcome of labor endeavors by all citizens, by every worker in his job. This might sound banal, but, after all, every elementary truth is basically banal. Nevertheless it remains a truth.

Yes, these are difficult times. We are wondering what the future will bring. I am asked increasingly often whether there will be war. This is not a simple question. This is not the place for thoughtless optimism. But there are no grounds for pessimism either. I am most profoundly confident, convinced that war can be averted and that it will be averted. My main arguments are strength and reason. I say strength because our nuclear missile potential does not leave an aggressor the slightest chance of surviving -- not the slightest. I say reason because, in spite of their bellicose posturing and verbiage, those who I am speaking of know very well, cannot fail to know, that retribution is inevitable.

We of course prefer another way of preserving peace, the path of disarmament and detente. And once Reagan's intoxication passes in the West, we will be ready to traverse our half of this path. The statement by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov reminds us over and over again of this.

START DELEGATIONS HOLD PLENARY SESSION 6 DEC

LD061050 Moscow TASS in English 1044 GMT 6 Dec 83

[Text] Geneva December 6 TASS -- A plenary meeting of the delegations of the USSR and the USA was held here today at the talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms.

SCIENTISTS' MEETING ON ARMS ISSUES DETAILED

PM051045 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Reason Against Nuclear Madness"]

[Text] The deployment of the new U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe creates a fundamentally different political and strategic situation both in Europe and throughout the world and sharply increases the threat of the outbreak of nuclear war. This was stated on 2 December in Moscow at a session of the Bureau of the Scientific Council for the Study of Problems of Peace and Disarmament.

The speakers -- Academician P.N. Fedoseyev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Academician N.N. Blokhin, president of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences; Academician M.A. Markov, and other scientists -- stressed that the U.S. leadership intends to use the deployment of qualitatively new nuclear systems to disrupt the equilibrium of forces on the continent and to seek military superiority. References to the Soviet "military threat" are designed merely to mislead public opinion and to prompt it to support the U.S. line, which is fraught with the danger of mortal consequences. The speakers emphasized that inasmuch as the White House, by its actions, has destroyed the possiblity of reaching a mutually acceptable accord at the talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe, their continuation under these conditions would merely be a cover for actions by the United States and a number of other NATO countries aimed at undermining European and international security.

The Scientific Council adopted a statement noting that Soviet scientists, like all Soviet people, fully support the Soviet Union's measures aimed at safeguarding the security of the USSR and the other socialist community countries set forth in Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's statement. In the present deteriorating international situation, the document says, it is the duty of all scientists to tell the public the truth about the real state of affairs, to show the danger and fultility of the militarist course of the United States and its allies, and to step up the struggle to curb the arms race.

COMPARISON OF TASS REPORT OF KOHL ILF CLAIMS

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 3 Decmeber carries in its First Edition on page 5 an Editorial Article on FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl's interpretation of a letter he received from Soviet leader Yuriy Andropov. The PRAVDA article, entitled "Deception is a Poor Counselor," has been compared with the Moscow TASS in English version published in the 2 Decmeber Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page AA 2, revealing the following variations:

PRAVDA omits the first paragraph and quotemarks at the beginning of the second paragraph.

Paragraph two, last line reads in PRAVDA: ...happened and that in a while everything will get back to normal. (supplying alternative rendering)

Paragraph five, line two reads in PRAVDA: ...November 24 explicitly and clearly says: "Should the (supplying "and clearly")

PRAVDA omits quotemarks at the end of the last paragraph.

WARSAW PACT DEFENSE MINISTERS MEET IN SOFIA

LD051542 Moscow TASS in English 1526 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] Sofia December 5 TASS -- A regular meeting of the Committee of Defense Ministers of the Warsaw Treaty member-states began here today.

The meeting is being chaired by Minister of People's Defense of Bulgaria, Army General Dobri Dzhurov.

The meeting is attended by Minister of Defence of Hungary Army General Lajos Czinege, Minister of National Defence of the GDR Army General Heinz Hoffmann, Minister of National Defence of Poland General of the Armour Florian Siwicki, Minister of National Defence of Romania Colonel-General Constantin Olteanu, Minister of Defence of the USSR Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Ustinov, and Minister of National Defence of Czechoslovakia Army General Martin Dzur.

The meeting is also attended by the commander-in-chief of the United Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty member-states, Marshal of the Soviet Union Viktor Kulikov, and Chief of Staff of the United Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty member-states, Army General Anatoliy Gribkov.

E. EUROPEAN LEADERS SUPPORT SOVIET INF POLICY

PM051152 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 83 First Edition p 5

[Valerian Skvortsov "Commentator's Column": "Following a Common Course"]

[Text] The development of interparty and interstate ties among the socialist community countries has been marked recently by two significant events. J. Kadar, first secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee, has been in Berlin, and a CSSR party and state delegation headed by G. Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and president of the CSSR, has been in Warsaw -- both on official friendly visits. Top-level meetings were held between E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, and J. Kadar, and between W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, and G. Husak.

The talks in Berlin and Warsaw took place under conditions where a particularly dangerous situation is taking shape in Europe. Washington, ignoring the opinion of the majority of the population of European countries, has begun the deployment in the western part of the continent of medium-range missiles targeted on the socialist countries. At the same time the United States and its NATO allies are continuing to reject all the Warsaw Pact states' peace initiatives.

Naturally, the socialist countries cannot passively observe the deployment of new American first-strike nuclear weapons in direct proximity to their borders.

The GDR and Hungary, and Poland and the CSSR confirmed yet again that they fully approve the measures aimed at ensuring the security of the USSR and the other socialist community states which were set forth in the statement of Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The documents published on the results of the Berlin and Warsaw meetings are imbued with determination to do everthing necessary to overcome the present dangerous stage in international relations through the joint efforts of the Warsaw Pact states in accordance with the Prague Political Declaration and the joint statement made by the socialist countries' leading party and state figure in Moscow in June 1983. And one of the chief conditions for this is the strengthening of the Warsaw Pact and CEMA and the fraternal countries' close cooperation and collaboration in all spheres.

Struggling to reliably ensure peace, the socialist community countries look with confidence to the future. While not underestimating the danger posed by U.S. imperialism's war preparations and adventurist policy, they believe in the victory of human reason and know their own tremendous potential and the force of their combined might.

Realism, a positive and constructive concerted approach to resolving complex international problems, friendship and all-around cooperation with the USSR and the other fraternal countries, and the strengthening of socialist economic integration -- this is the leitmotiv of the meetings and talks held in Berlin and Warsaw, and these are the common guidelines of policy and action in our community.

CEMA FOREIGN TRADE COMMISSION MEETS IN MOSCOW

PM051641 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Intensifying Business Contacts"]

[Text] The 66th session of the CEMA Standing Commission on Foreign Trade was held in Moscow 29 November through 1 December.

Taking part in the work of the commission's session were delegations from the CEMA countries and the SFRY, the International Bank for Economic Cooperation, and the International investment Bank.

There was a discussion of the tasks stemming from the resolutions of the 37th meeting of the council session and of the Executive Committee of CEMA. Measures aimed at their implementation were approved.

The plan for the commission's work for 1984-1985 was approved. It reflects measures to implement the instructions of the session and of the CEMA Executive Committee. Great attention is paid to the further development of trade. It is also planned to implement comprehensive measures to improve the provision of foodstuffs to the CEMA countries' population.

There was an examination of the progress in talks and the conclusion between the CEMA countries and the SFRY of protocols on reciprocal deliveries of goods for 1984 and contracts for that year. There was a discussion of questions of working on the coordination of the CEMA countries' national economic plans and the forthcoming conclusion of long-term trade agreements for the next 5-year period.

The resolutions which were adopted are aimed at further developing cooperation and at defending the interests of the socialist community countries under conditions where the imperialist circles are steering a course toward the further aggravation of the international situation and the undermining of normal international relations.

The session took place in an atmosphere of comradely cooperation and mutual understanding.

Patolichev Meets With Nestorowicz

LD012318 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1800 GMT 1 Dec 83

[Text] During his stay in Moscow in connection with the 66th meeting of the CEMA Standing Commission on Foreign Trade, Foreign Trade Minister Tadeusz Nestorowicz conducted talks with Soviet Foreign Trade Minister Nikolay Patolichev on work related to the signing of next year's trade protocol. They also discussed the implementation of agreements concluded 3 days ago in Warsaw on the construction of a gas pipeline from the Soviet Union to Poland.

BOVIN ANALYZES DELHI COMMONWEALTH CONFERENCE

LD052145 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 30 Dec 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] A conference of heads of state and government of the Commonwealth member countries has ended its work in New Delhi. Aleksandr Bovin, IZVESTIYA's political observer, is called upon to speak:

[Begin Bovin recording] Good evening comrades. The Commonwealth to which we are referring is a very specific organization. It is, if you wish, a shadow, a specter of the former British Empire. Britain and 47 other states, mainly its former dominions, colonies, and dependencies, are members of the Commonwealth, of which the British queen is head. The Commonwealth is extremely heterogeneous. It includes countries with very different economic levels, different political orientations, different prevailing religious and ethnic compositions. However, the common colonial past and the community of the tasks being resolved by the majority of the countries belonging to the Third World ensures, despite the desire of the former metropolis, a noticeable anti-imperialist, antiwar, and anticolonialist potential of the Commonwealth.

In considering the political field, it should be stated that such most acute issues as the U.S. intrusion into Grenada, the situation in Central America, the crisis in Cyprus, Namibia, the racist policy of the Republic of South Africa were at the center of the conference's attention. The majority of the conference participants resolutely condemned the imperialist attempts to put down by force of arms the peoples' desire for social change.

Indira Gandhi stated: Social change should be regarded as an internal reaction to the outdated and repressive structures of the authority. Gandhi said: Each time the attempt to carry out change by peaceful means is suppressed, violence takes over. No external support, no intervention will stop the tendency toward change.

It was repeatedly stated in Delhi that the existing economic order established by the developed capitalist countries hinders the economic and social progress of former colonial periphery.

Compared with previous Commonwealth conferences, the most recent devoted much more attention to general, global political problems pertaining to the general situation in the world. The conference called for the ending of the arms race, for a constructive dialogue between East and West, and for the strengthening of the United Nations's role.

Mrs Thatcher's speech at the conference sounded a sharply discordant note. In her speech she did not utter a single word about Namibia, Grenada, Cyprus, South Africa, or disarmament problems. According to THE STATESMAN, the British prime minster had declared in a crude manner to the developing countries that they should undertake efforts and continue to supply developed countries with raw materials and agree with the rules of international financial institutions without complaint.

The final documents of the conference bear the inevitable mark of a compromise, of some kind of political vagueness. But generally speaking the work of the conference, which was represented by one-fourth of the entire mankind, demonstrated growing anxiety for the destiny of peace and for the future of our earth. [end recording].

BALEBANOV DETAILS UPCOMING 'NATO WEEK' AGENDA

LD060239 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1101 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] Brussels, 5 Dec (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Albert Balebanov reports:

At the NATO headquarters in the Brussels suburb of Evere, today sees the start of another "winter Atlantic week" -- a series of conferences of leading military-political bodies of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc. It is being opened by a 2-day session of the Eurogroup of NATO, in which defense ministers of 12 countries (excluding France and Spain) are taking part. Today, too, a session of the bloc's Military Committee, with the participation of the chiefs of general staff of member-states of the alliance, is being held. On 6 and 7 December there will be a session of the NATO Military Planning Committee. The "week" will end with a session of the NATO Council at the level of foreign minsters, which will be held on 8 and 9 December.

The present round of Atlantic conferences is taking place at a tricky moment, when, as a result of the start of siting in West Europe of new American first-strike nuclear missiles, a qualitatively new situation has arisen in the world, a situation characterized by a still greater aggravation of the international tension and fraught with a dangerous new spiral of the arms race, leading to an intensification of the threat of war.

The question of future relations between East and West, in light of the deployment in Europe of the American medium-range missiles, and the United State's wrecking of the Soviet-American talks on limitation of nuclear arms in Europe, acquires special significance at the NATO sessions.

At the request of a number of West European countries, on the agenda of the conferences of the military-political leaders of the 16 countries have been placed questions connected with the fate of the arms talks, and with the coming Stockholm conference on confidence-building measures and security and disarmament in Europe.

The practical implementation of the NATO missile decision that has begun is arousing massive protests by the broad public masses both in the United States itself and in West Europe, where the overwhemling majority of the population comes out agianst the Pershing II and cruise missiles that have been imposed on them. All of this has created a certain tension within NATO.

It is no coincidence that the Pentagon and NATO have placed on the agenda the question of "strengthening Atlantic unity." Disquiet is being aroused among the NATO strategists by the position of Denmark whose parliament has come out openly against the deployment of U.S. missiles in West Europe and has demanded that the country's special position on this question be included in the final communique of the NATO Council session. Greece also comes out unambiguously against the NATO missile decision. Belgium and the Netherlands, in spite of very strong pressure and threats from the White House, have not yet agreed to the deployment of U.S. missiles on their territory.

EUROMISSILES POSE 'THREAT' TO AFRICA, MIDEAST

LD060719 Moscow TASS in English 0703 GMT 6 Dec 83

[Text] New York December 6 TASS -- TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets writes:

The militaristic policy of the United States jeopardizes the stability of the international situation. The most telltale manifestations of this policy are the reckless and adventurist course of actions in the deployment of new American missiles in Europe.

This idea was stressed at the meeting of the First Committee of the U.N. General Assembly. The committee is discussing questions pertaining to the implementation of the declaration on strenghtening internatinal security, which was adopted by the U.N. in the 1970 on the Soviet Union's initiative.

Oleg Troyanovskiy, the USSR permanent representative to the U.N. said that the USA did not wish from the very outset to reach a mutually acceptable agreement on nuclear weapons in Europe. It has a stake above all in the deployment of its missiles.

Recalling the countermeasures taken by the Soviet Union, the Soviet representative stressed that they by no means signalled a change in the principled fundamentals of Soviet foreign policy. Even in the present-day situation no questions arises for us what policy shall by purused in international affiars. This will be, as before, the policy of detente and of curbing the arms race.

The deployment of new American first-strike weapons in the territory of West European states has created a new situation in Europe and all over the world. The real danger of a world nuclear war has substantially increased, he pointed out. A new round of the arms race has been started. For the first time after the Second World War a direct threat has again emerged from German soil to the Soviet Union and the other socialist states. As the GDR represenative stressed, the numerous initiatives of the socialist states in that field were disregarded in a most irresponsible way.

The introduction of American "Pershing" and cruise missiles into Europe, said Vietnam's representative Pham Ngak, has increased the danger of a nuclear conflagration in Europe. It was also pointed out that if the USA and NATO implement their plans, not only Europe but also tens of states in Northern and Central Africa, the Middle and Near East and South West Asia will find themselves in the sights of American missiles, the Libyan representative pointed out.

BLOC APPEAL AT UN AGAINST 'ECONOMIC DICTATE'

LD031003 Moscow TASS in English 0937 GMT 3 Dec 83

[Text] New York December 3 TASS -- Socialist countries have called upon the world community to outlaw the imperialist policy of economic dictate as contradicting the United Nations Charter and generally recognized norms of international law.

This appeal is contained in a joint statement made by the delegations from Belorussia, Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, the Soviet Union, the Ukraine and Czechoslovakia, distributed at the UN headquarters as an official document of the General Assembly. The statement strongly denounces the imperialist policy of economic dictate, blackmail and threats. This policy contributes to further deterioration of the international climate and poses a threat to universal peace and security.

EEC MEETING IN ATHENS REACHES 'DEADLOCK'

LD060722 Moscow TASS in English 0711 GMT 6 Dec 83

[Text] Athens December 6 TASS -- The discussions here at the current session of the European Council of the Communities at the level of the heads of state and government of Common Market countries have reached a deadlock.

Under consideration at the session are such problems, which are of importance to the EEC, as a reform of the community's agrarian policy and a size of Britain's payment to the budget of "the ten". According to the Greek prime minister's office, the second day of the session did not lead to any results.

The French newspaper L'HUMANITE pointed out that contradictions at the session in Athens are mounting with every next speech made by participants. The newspaper points out the existence of serious Anglo-French differences over agricultural questions and over the problem of determining an amount of Britain's financial contribution to the EEC budget. The opinion of the newspaper LIBERATION is that the course of the meeting in Athens if indicative of its utter failure which everyone foresaw but hoped that the failure would not be so obvious. An atmosphere of pessimism dominated at the meeting for two days, LE MATIN emphasizes.

UN DELIBERATIONS ON NAMIBIAN ISSUE NOTED

LD030320 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 2 Dec 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] The 38th session of the UN General Assembly has completed its discussion of the Namibian issue. The speakers at the discussion demanded the immediate granting of independence to Namibia, which is illegally occupied by the South African racists. All told, five resolutions were adopted on Namibia. It was reaffirmed that the only basis for a just settlement of this problem is Security Council Resolution No 435, which provides for the withdrawal of the Republic of South Africa's troops from Namibian territory and the holding of free elections there under international supervision.

The General Assembly categorically rejected attempts by the United States and the Pretoria regime to link the question of the granting of independence to Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. At the same time it demanded that the Western powers cease their cooperation with the South African racists, above all in the military and nuclear spheres.

A further important point was confirmed by the General Assembly. It once again expressed its support for the just struggle of the Namibian people headed by SWAPO [South West African People's Organization], its sole legitimate representative. It is characteristic that on this occasion the United States and other Western powers decided not to oppose openly the overwhelming majority of states and preferred to abstain during the vote. However, this is no more than a diplomatic maneuver, which can scarcely mislead the international public. After all, it is thanks to U.S. support that the racist regime can permit itself to challenge the world community and, ignoring its decisions, continue its unlawful occupation of Namibia.

It is well known that since it came to power the Reagan administration, at the UN, has been pursuing a policy of so-called constructive cooperation with the apartheid state. President Reagan dirctly calls the Republic of South Africa an ally of the United States.

This line being followed by the United States has been confirmed once again Chester Crocker, U.S. assistant secretary of state for African affairs. At a meeting with journalists in Washington he let it be understood that the United States will not permit implementation of Security Council Resolution No 435 until their conditions -- he said indeed Pretoria's conditions -- for linking the Namibian question with the withdrawal of Cuban servicemen from Angola are fulfilled. In this connection, Crocker superciliously stated that Washington did not care about the opnions of other states. We do not need anybody's support or approval for our policy, he said.

COMPARISON OF SHITIKOV, ZAGLADIN CONFERENCE

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 18 November carries in its Second Edition on page 4 a TASS report on the press conference on INF and CSCE given by Aleksey Shitikov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, and Vadim Zagladin, secretary of the Foreign Relations Commission of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee's International Department. The PRAVDA report, entitled "Peace for Europe, Peace for the Planet: Press Conference in Moscow," has been compared with the Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian version published in the 21 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages CC 12-13, revealing the following variations:

Paragraph one, line one begins in PRAVDA: A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists has been devoted to the Soviet public's attitude to problems of strengthening security and cooperation in Europe in the light of the Helsinki Accords, and to the results of the recent Madrid meeting. It was held in Moscow 17 November. (supplying variant first paragraph)

Paragraph two, line four reads in PRAVDA: ...final document. This important document is based...(inserting "important")

Paragraph four, line two reads in PRAVDA: ...of confrontation and material preparation for war...(inserting "material")

Same paragraph, line three reads in PRAVDA: ...threat to peace. We have good reason to note that never before in the recent past has the situation in the world arena been so tense. Throughout the world mankind is encountering an unprecedented upsurge of the U.S. imperialism's aggressiveness. (supplying expanded passage)

Paragraph five, line eight reads in PRAVDA: ..."state terrorism" against all other states which prove in any way inconvenient to Washington. Recent events in the Near East, Central America, and also the Caribbean provide graphic proof that it is Washington which has made terrorism the main component of its state policy. (supplying expanded passage)

Paragraph eight, line two reads in PRAVDA: ...Helsinki and Madrid. This is assisted by Soviet public organizations, particularly the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, which was set up 12 years ago during preparations for the all-European conference.

We believe, A.P. Shitikov said in conclusion, that the struggle to end the arms race in Europe and throughout the world must be waged constantly and in all conditions, regardless of what turn international events may take. Soviet people extend the hand of friendship to all people who are prepared, irrespective of their political, religious, and other convictions, to undertake joint efforts to achieve these aims.

Professor V.V. Zagladin, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union Foreign Affairs Commission and first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Section, who spoke next, noted that the press conference was taking place at a time when international relations in Europe may enter a new, and by no means positive, stage of their development. (supplying alternative, expanded passage)

Paragraph eleven, last line reads in PRAVDA: ...West European countries. In other words, the main obstacle in the path of the further purusit of the Helsinki line in Europe is being created through the actions of the U.S. Administration. The U.S. decision to begin the deployment of its missiles without waiting for the outcome of the talks represents a most serious undermining of the very method of negotiations. (supplying alternative passage)

Paragraph twelve, last line reads in PRAVDA: .. such a shift is very dangerous, primarily for the peoples of those selfsame countries.

Indeed, it is claimed in the West that the steps being taken by the United States at present stem from a desire to strengthen West Europe's security, which is allegedly threatened by the Soviet Union and specifically by our SS-20 missiles. But this is an untruth. The Soviet Union, like the other Warsaw Pact countries, has never threatened anybody. The steps which we have taken in recent years were designed only to strengthen our own security. (supplying additional passage)

Paragraph fourteen, last line reads in PRAVDA: ...has been announced, V.V. Zagladin continued. They will apply both to the territory of the West European countries where the missiles are or will be deployed and to the territory of the United States itself. (supplying additional passage)

Paragraph sixteen, last line reads in PRAVDA: ...sole, invariable choice.

Members of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation also answered journalists' questions. (omitting reference to Zagladin and supplying additional final graf.)

LEBANON, INF 'PRETEXTS' FOR U.S. 'MILITARISM'

LD051919 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1510 GMT 5 Dec 83

["Washington's Militarism Is a Threat to Peace" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 5 Dec (TASS) -- TASS observer Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Recent events have shown that wherever it is possible to use military force, the Reagan administration, under various fabricated pretexts, uses Marines and combat flotillas. Thus, internal events in Grenada were depicted by Washington as "a threat to U.S. security," and the independent sovereign island was crucified by Reagan's crusaders.

Having dealt with what was essentially a tiny unarmed island, Washington's leaders unleashed off the shores of Lebanon a giant fleet with 30,000 servicemen and 300 aircraft. When the U.S. President sent the first contingents of Marines to Lebanon last year, he entreated the whole world to believe him that all this was being done for exclusively "peaceful" aims. In fact, as subsequent events showed, this was the beginning of the U.S. aggression, under the cover of mere phraseology about "love of peace."

After the U.S. Marines had consolidated themselves in Beirut, Reagan unceremoniously announced that the U.S. "has vital interests" in the Lebanon. Today, while expanding his military adventure in that country, the White House chief and his team are trying to give the impression that Lebanon is apparently the key to a solution of the whole Near East problem. The main culprit guilty of destabilizing the situation in the Near East, and the aggressor -- Israel -- is turned by Washington into a "strategic partner" and a very close ally of the United States.

The leaders of the present U.S. Administration, not disdaining the use of any kind of invention, are extending the U.S. military presence many thousands of kilometers beyond U.S. territory using these inventions as a pretext. The deployment of new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles that has begun on the territory of a number of West European countries is especially dangerous. It is dangerous because U.S. nuclear weapons are being moved right up to the borders of the USSR and its allies. And in this situation representatives of the U.S. Government are again duping the public and pretending that nothing special is happening in Europe.

U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger even states that "the prospects for success at the talks (with the Soviet Union) have never been better than they are now." In other words, one begins to think that the more brazen the course pursued by the United States and the more acute the confrontation with the Soviet Union then, as he says, the greater is the probability that Moscow "will return to the negotiating table" in Geneva. But that is the strategy of madness. As the statement by Soviet leader Yuriy Andropov stresses, in a nuclear age one cannot look at the world through the slit of narrow egotistical interests. Responsible state figures have one choice: to do everything possible to avert nuclear catastrophe. Any other position is short-sighted and, what is more, suicidal.

But Washington is stubbornly continuing its militarist course in the hope of achieving predominant positions in the world for the United States. It is for these purposes that the United States creates critical situations one after the other in various parts of the world.

MOSCOW ROUNDTABLE SCORES U.S. 'MISPERCEPTIONS'

AU041741 Sofia OTECHESTVEN FRONT in Bulgarian 1 Dec 83 pp 1-4

[Report on roundtable talk held at the Moscow office of OTECHESTVEN FRONT, organized by its correspondents Lyubomir Koralov and Vasil Asparukhov and attended by Aleksandr Bovin, member of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and IZVESTIYA political observer; Doctor of Historical Sciences Yuriy Kashlev, head of the Information Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Prof Edward Arap-Ogli; and Doctor of Economic Sciences Prof Gennadiy Khromushin of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences: "Reagan's Doomed Attack; The Link Between Ideology and Politics, or Why Does Washington Beset the Planet With Kilotons of Nuclear Warheads; The Pseudoarguments of the U.S. Psychological War Against the USSR; The Pentagon Builds Down Armaments by Building Up Their Number" -- date not given]

[Text] A crisis in the detente -- This is how one can briefly define the main characteristic of the international situation. We are again convinced that history is developing not only along an ascending line. The main cause for the regression and dangerous exacerbation of the world situation following the deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe, which has actually already begun, is the sharp change in the foreign political course of the White House. One can observe a new phenomenon in its actions in practice -- an extreme ideological bent to its foreign policy, that prevents it from soberly assessing world events and finding correct roads to peaceful coexistence in a world beset with millions of kilotons of nuclear warheads. This link betweer ideology and politics is the subject of a "roundtable" talk held at the OTECHESTVEN FRONT office in Moscow, attended by: Aleksandr Bovin, member of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet and IZVESTIYA political observer; Doctor of Historical Sciences Yuriy Kashlev, head of the Information Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Prof Edward Arap-Ogli; and Doctor of Economic Sciences Prof Gennadiy Khromushin of the CPSU Central Committe Academy of Social Sciences.

Aleksandr Bovin: It is natural for each foreign policy -- of the Soviet Union, of the United States, and of every other country -- to be based on certain ideological prerequesites. At the same time, however, politics itself does not have to be closely linked with ideology, because if we directly bring ideology into politics it will come out that we are enemies with the Americans and therefore we will have to follow such a course of confrontation that no talks between us would be at all necessary. Since there actually is no such link, then in spite of the fundamental difference in ideological approaches, we can find a basis of cooperation regardless of political differences. These actually were the prerequisites on which detente was based.

The characteristic trait in the U.S. approach, particularly under Reagan, is the attempt to transfer ideology into politics. As a result of this, the Americans, who have always proudly emphasized that they could assess a situation from a pragmatic point of view, seem to have lost their sense of reality. They have made a confrontation between us and them, between the East and the West and between socialism and capitalism, into a basic goal of their foreign policy. Here is to be found a primitive approach to the world, because Reagan's very world outlook, if the term world outlook could be applies to the present U.S. President, is a naive one. In his view, on one side is America, which is the manifestation of absolute good in the ideological and political sphere, and on the other side is the Soviet Union, which represents absolute evil. The entire foreign policy is reduced to a struggle between absolute good and absolute evil. This purely ideological basis, however, does not allow a reasonable foreign policy to be pursued, because politics is based on compromise, and peaceful coexistence and detente are possible only when we can search for and reach mutually compromising decisions.

If we review history, however, as a struggle between God and the Devil, no compromises at all could then be achieved... This ideological approach in itself is undermining the basis of any agreement, and therefore no matter which sphere we refer to -- the Geneva talks that are already suspended, the Vienna talks, and everything else -- this U.S. approach generates difficulties that are frequently insurmountable. Let us take for example Grenada. Even Thatcher herself has recently said: If we were to decide to dispatch troops to places whose regimes we do not like, this would be terrible. Even Thatcher said this. For Reagan this was a simple matter. He did not like the regime in Grenada and he dispatched troops there.

The problem consists in the fact that the world around us is undergoing colossal sociopolitical transformations. The task of each politician -- American, Soviet, or Bulgarian -- is to be able to adapt his country's policy to the changes that are now taking place. When the Americans agreed to detente and when they held constructive talks with us, this was an attempt to adapt their policy to the changes in life and in the world that had emerged. Now the reverse process is occurring -- Reagan is trying to adapt the whole world to the interests of the United States as he understands them. Such an approach, however, again undermines the realistic basis for any constructive agreements. Evidence of this is the failure of the Geneva talks.

The dominance of a conservative, reactionary, and archaic ideology in the United States, an ideology which is being transformed to politics, is the main obstacle for regulating disputed problems. I think that Reagan cannot change himself. Romain Rolland has actually said that one can begin to understand something of life only when one comes upon its sharp corners. Reagan has already came upon such sharp corners but having in mind the way he understands life, I have not noticed that he has changed himself. Since Reagan will probably stay in the White House for another 4 years, it is my belief that for that period of time we will not succeed in reaching an agreement on anything meaningful. We will, of course, conduct negotiations, we will try to sign agreements and we will probably even succeed somewhere on the political fringes. However, I think that concerning the main and basic issues we will have to face a game of nerves, confrontation, and conflicts for another 4 years. This is not a very optimistic prospect. I would very much like to be wrong but I can draw no other conclusion at present.

Editorial board: Thus we draw the conclusion that while Reagan is in power no serious agreement between USSR and the United States could be reached. Is there any other evidence that can confirm this idea?

Yuriy Kashlev: In my opinion, this also is confirmed by Reagan's present military program because the slogan aired by the United States "to build down by building up" could hardly be a basis for any reduction. Secondly, the evolution of the U.S. strategic way of thinking has obviously recently showed a trend toward implementation of its plans for imperial domination. As is known, detente was based on the so-called conception of mutually assured destruction, or in other words -- fear. In the nuclear century there will not be any victor; there will only be two defeated sides. The one who starts the war first will perish just as the other one will. We, as well as the Americans, have proceeded from this point of view. The Americans, however, now hope to have elaborated a strategy for waging a nuclear war that will secure them victory. This task, however, is as insoluble as is trying to square a circle. They, however, have set this task for themselves, and a danger exists that they may believe they can achieve it.

Aleksandr Bovin: As far as I understand the internatonal situation, the main thing in the U.S. policy and the most important point remains the guarantee of achieving military supremacy. A few days ago I was in Stockholm and visited the SIPRI Institute, where I had a talk with its director. He told me that according to data they have on strategic systems, there is an approximate parity between us and the United States.

The same was also asserted by the London Institute for Strategic Research. Many Americans also assert this. Reagan, however, is proceeding from the assumption that America is lagging and thus the emphasis is focused on modernizing the strategic triad.

Arap-Ogli: I am absolutely convinced that there will not be any war, a big war. I am convinced that there is light at the end of the tunnel. I am also convinced that while Reagan is in the White House, the arms race will continue. The entire struggle that is being waged now and the active policy of the socialist countries will, of course, continue. The antiwar movement in West Europe and in the United States itself is a positive factor, but there are also some things over which we cannot have any influence. While appreciating the great international prestige and strength of the antiwar movement, we must have no illusions that we can change the policy of the U.S. Administration.

Aleksandr Bovin: The most important thing today is not to allow any further estrangement from detente. On that score, the situation in America is a peculiar one. Let us take for example the developments in Grenada. What in practice is the U.S. political class, if I can express myself in this manner, all the basic mass information media, and the U.S. intellectual elite have been against Reagan after the Grenada events. The majority, however, the so-called man-on-the-street, is backing Reagan's action. There were several polls there which were certainly not manipulated and which show the feelings of the man-on-the-street. The fact that Reagan has promised to restore U.S. greatness and that he could hit the table with his fist makes the average man think he is a strong President. Thus Reagan can easily say the following: Just listen -- the country is supporting me. He manipulates with the psychology of the man-on-the-street, who is very susceptible to every chauvinistic manifestation. Reagan simply plays with those moods and uses them.

Gennadiy Khromushin: The thesis of Aleksandr Evgeneyevich on the mutual relations between ideology and foreign policy of the present U.S. President could be further developed. Here is a very indicative case: Sometime in the twenties, the question of recognizing Soviet Russia had been discussed in the United States. This question was discussed in detail and a terrible resolution was adopted: The recognition of Soviet Russia should be postponed until its socialist system is changed. This was almost an anecdotal resolution. Following this, as is known, the United States recognized us in 1933. While appraising the ideological position of the present administration, we see that the main point is to retreat from a normal ideological struggle as we understand it -- a struggle of theory, of world outlooks, and of a return to the philosophy of not recognizing socialism.

Yuriy Kashlev: Now some military directives openly aim at destroying the USSR. If we recall the period of 5-10 years ago, then we will see that then, too, the imperialists were very hostile toward us, but this was a struggle of ideas. You remember the theories of convergence and deideologization, the one about the technotronic society, and so forth. Many theories, all of which sprang from the recognition that the ideological struggle against socialism is a long one, and even from the recognition of the legality of socialism's existence.

Look now at the U.S. newspapers, magazines, and statements. President Reagan even says that he will throw Marxism-Leninism on the ash heap of history, and will annihilate socialism in general. Those are primitive anticommunist statements. The present administration is not satisfied with the prospect of a long struggle against socialism. It demands nonrecognition of the laws of socialism, and applies such methods of the ideological struggle which can produce immediate results, which can create as quickly as possible confusion in the socialist camp and provoke antisocialist unrest, such as that they tried to create in Poland. This is one of its characteristics.

The other is the transfer of what we used to call ideological struggle from the area of ideas to the area of diversion, subversion, and psychological war. Reagan himself is a glowing example of this phenomenon. Virtually every week he makes repulsive anti-Soviet and anticommunist declarations on various occasions, such as the Baltic Countries Day, Sakharov Day, Cuba Day, and so forth. On each occasion he calls for nonrecognition of the socialist system. Now the United States makes use of a great propaganda apparatus. It is tuned onto the waves of diversion and psychological war. All U.S. radio stations are issuing direct instructions for subversion. The events in Poland are a clear example of this. Even before Reagan, during the time of Carter, Washington developed several major campaigns. The human rights campaign, the campaign about the ostensible Soviet threat, and the campaign about the participation of the socialist countries in international terrorism belong to Carter's time. The most eloquent example is the campaign about Bulgarian participation in the attempt against the people. These campaigns are no longer a struggle of different world views. They are built of falsehood and represent an attempt to drive public opinion away from socialism. The radio stations Free Europe, Liberty, and the Voice of America are propagating rude and primitive anti-communism.

Thus, everything is being transferred from the area of theoretical dispute to the area of subversive activity.

Aleksandr Bovin: Nixon, for example, was an anticommunist. He had no sympathy for communism but understood perfectly that if we do not want to perish together we have to reach agreement. Reagan is also an anticommunist, but he lacks this understanding of reality. His anticommunism is detached from what is happening now. This is a purely ideological situation, which has nothing to do with the processes we are observing. This is primitive. Everything in the world that the Americans do not like comes from the USSR. Everywhere they see KGB agents who are organizing putsches and revolutions. This is how Reagan views the world.

Yuriy Kashlev: Of course, it has correctly been said that Nixon, and I would add Kissinger and Brzezinski, are no lesser anticommunists from an objective point of view. However, if we open their works, speeches, and memoirs we will easily discover attempts of theoretical argumentation. What is characteristic of Reagan and his broad circle of aides, is the transfer of the problems of anticommunism from theoretical discussion to actual practice. This means that they do not bother to look for some theoretical arguments, because they do not try to theoretically refute communism, despite the fact that they are dealing with this. We must stress here that their attempts to theoretically deny communism and Marxism are unsuccessful. Reagan stresses the importance of influencing the simple, basic consciousness and emotions, and not on influencing people's reason. Thus, instead of political struggle we have psychological war. And if we review the activity of Reagan administration from this point of view, including the activity of all information systems controlled by the administration, we will see that there is no practical theory, but simply manipulation of the consciousness.

Arap-Ogli: There is one interesting detail. Recently the Americans banned the appearance of Soviets on their television. This is not accidental. We present serious arguments against the demagogy campaign conducted by them. These arguments have a certain influence. Therefore the Americans, who supposedly live in the most democratic state, prevented Academician Arbatov and Vitaliy Kobysh, among others, from speaking on their television. They feel that our arguments influence even their people.

Yuriy Kashlev: The Americans, who boast that in their country there is freedom of speech -- even John Foster Dulles said that if he had to select one foreign policy principle, he would select freedom of speech -- admit that their news agencies control two-thirds of the world's flow of information.

At the same time, the United States is one of the most tightly closed to foreign information sources. Statistics show that only 3 percent of the information published by U.S. newspapers comes from foreign sources. You mentioned their attempts to influence human emotions. We can do this in our society, but it is very difficult to reach the West, especially U.S. society, which is guarded against the influence of world public opinion by laws, traditions, and a monopoly on information. This can explain why such a huge percentage of people support even the most stupid actions of Washington. We can reach them with only great difficulty. Thus I think that the propaganda problem has an external side too.

Arap-Ogli: I can cite an example which will support your position. An American reader wrote me about one my of my new books. He says that he is very satisfied with the book, and adds: "I live in a free society, but this is a pseudopolitical freedom." He adds an article from a magazine which propagates neoconservatism, and says: "I have no other sources of free information but the official ones."

When I received this letter, I can honestly say that I was shocked. I had the personal impression that America is a free country, and suddenly — this letter.

Editorial Board: In this psychological war there obviously is a system of pseudoarguments which influences the consciousness of the average man. What arguments or pseudoarguments are they?

Yuriy Kashlev: First of all I must say that if the theory on psychological war has obtained an upsurge somewhere in the world, then this is in the United States. As far as "arguments" are concerned, the Americans take first prize in the competition for creating the theory of propaganda stereotypes. Even Lippman dealt with this issue in the past. Over many years, and especially during the Carter and Reagan administrations the same crude stereotypes were inserted in the consciousness of the Americans. For example the stereotype of the "Red menace." This is a very old stereotype. Even Lenin spoke about the "red militarism of bourgeois propaganda." This slogan is repeated thousands of times in the statements of Reagan and Weinberger, in various books such as "Soviet Military Power," and in various booklets put together by the CIA and published in millions of copies. I am afraid that a significant part of U.S. society believes in this stereotype -- in the Soviet military threat, and in the Red menace.

This stereotype occupies and first place. The second relates to the so-called totalitarianism of socialist society. In this area too there is much research dealing with theoretical aspects and practical methods. They maintain that the one-party system leads to a lack of criticism. This second stereotype is also being asserted very strongly. They mix together support for national liberation movements and support for international terrorism. This is another stereotype strongly developed by U.S. propaganda. I have not said anything new here. These are old stereotypes, but they are not just abstract. They are being daily developed by ideological institutions and supported by propaganda actions and declarations on the part of the White House leadership and so forth. These stereotypes are very strong. They can acquire some new elements related, let us say, to Poland or Afghanistan. However, the circle of the stereotypes is very limited. For decades they have been sticking to the same stereotypes.

Gennadiy Khromushin: One of the most widely used stereotypes is the one about the so-called secret hand. Adam Smith once said that there is an invisible hand which directs everything that is taking place throughout the world.

Arap-Ogli: The invisible hand of the Kremlin?

Yuriy Kashlev: No. They have invented the following idea: If something does not develop according to our plan, this means that some secret hand is acting. Thus, each time something happens, their task is to spot the secret hand. This can be the hand of Moscow, Beijing, the PLO, Bulgaria... a mythical hand. Whatever happens -- calamities, revolutions, shares that are falling or raising -- the mythical secret hand is acting. This affects the minds of the people terribly...

Arap-Ogli: I think that the following description of the situation is correct: What is now happening in the United States is being greeted with concern by the U.S. allies. These streams of contradictions are repeated now on the Grenada issue, on the forced implementation of the decision to deploy the U.S. missiles in Europe, and on various political levels. The Americans are constantly accusing us of wanting to drive a wedge between Western Europe and the United States. This, by the way, is another of their foreign policy stereotypes. In fact they temselves are driving a wedge between themselves and Western Europe with their clumsy acts, which are shocking the Europeans, especially when one takes into consideration the fact that the political culture in Western Europe is immeasurably higher than in America.

West European politicians are shocked by this vulgar policy of Washington. We understand that there always will be certain class and social relations between American and Western Europe. However, the contradictions are becoming ever more evident even against the background of their social and class community. The very fact that there is disunity in the NATO camp is very indicative and proves that even the NATO countries are concerned with the present U.S. foreign policy course. And let us not forget the Third World, where the protests against Reagan's policy are also growing, as the indignation evoked by the Grenada issue showed.

Yuriy Kashlev: One must not forget that now Reagan is making unprecedented efforts to intensify the ideological influence over the Third World. Our press and the press of the socialist countries wrote much about the programs on "democracy" and "public diplomacy." This is not one of the regular tricks they announce from time to time. This is a biparty 20-year program -- until the 21st century -- with a great deal of concrete initiatives. I have read it in the original. These are 50 pages of concrete initiatives about ideological influence over the Third World. This means that simultaneously with pursuing the course of confrontation with us and intensifying the arms race, they are also thinking about their rear, i.e., how to secure for themselves the support of the Third World, or at least its neutrality.

Aleksandr Bovin: There is one additional characteristic of the American policy. When they look at the Third World, they do not see its problems. For them all changes, shocks, coups, and countercoups are first of all a struggle between East and West. Despite the fact that we all clearly understand that the struggle between East and West affects the Third World, there still are certain characteristics of the Third World that cannot be overlooked, namely, its underdevelopment, struggle to overcome this situation, and striving toward progress. All this does not exist for the Americans. For them there are some terrorists or KGB agents who are pulling the strings. This is the U.S. attitude toward the Third World. Now we are paying great attention to the main problem -- the problem of war and peace, but in addition to this problem there are two additional problems that at least potentially are no less dangerous: The first is the North-South problem, namely, the widening of the gap between the developed and underdeveloped countries, something which already destablizes the world situation and will do so even more in the future. The second problem is the ecological one -- in the broadest sense of the word. Sometimes we do not realize how sharp the ecological problem has become. I hope that we shall not reach a catastrophe, but this global problem exists, and we must coordinate our activity in the struggle for peace and disarmament with our activity related to the other two problems. In the final account the disarmament issue is an antiwar problem, but it has two other huge dimensions. If we do not stop the arms race, if all those colossal sums continue to be spent in arms, then the North-South problem will be exacerbated.

On the other hand, if there is no disarmament, we shall continue to cause the deterioration of ecological conditions, and not allocate funds for environmental protection. Thus the problem of the struggle for peace and disarmament, in addition to its specifically political aspect, has two other very important aspects that must be taken into consideration.

Editorial Board: There is no doubt that the struggle for peace and disarmament is closely connected with the possibility of expanding the economic aid for the underdeveloped countries. This political year began with the Prague declaration of the socialist countries, and at its very beginning, it defined the close relation between economic underdevelopment and mankind's ecological problems. From what we have seen so far, the West, led by the United States, does not share this opinion.

Arap-Ogli: This is so. The policy conducted by Reagan distracts mankind from solving these fundamental problems because a new round in the arms race means new billions for military needs. This is the danger to all mankind of the policy which the United States is trying to impose on the world. One of the dangerous tendencies is the fact that the arms race, which used to be concentrated on an East-West axis, is encompassing now the Third World. They are accumulating weapons -- not nuclear, but conventional weapons. However, these countries' economic situations are such that the military expenditures create serious social consequences.

Editorial Board: According to some sources 100 of the 600 billion dollars spent annually on arms are spent by the developing countries.

Arap-Ogli: The sum spent annually on arms is exactly as great as the combined foreign debts of all developing countries put together. One year without military spending would mean no foreign debts.

Aleksandr Bovin: For example, the World Health Organization needs $80 million to finally liquidate malaria. What great reserves could be utilized if the arms race were tamed and more funds allocated. Therefore the line pursued by the USSR, the socialist and most the nonaligned countries is to stop the arms race and begin disarmament. This line not only has political significance in the framework of the struggle for peace and against war. It has great human significance. It is a problem facing all mankind because it involves releasing funds so that people can live better.

Gennadiy Khromushin: Not only the stereotype of the Red menace but also its opposite side -- the colossus with feet of clay -- now has great significance for the U.S. Aministration. This is so because onthe one hand they talk about the Red menace and about the ostenisble military superiority of the Soviet Union, and on the other hand they are trying to convince the average U.S. citizen that Soviet society is characterized by stagnation in the economic and socioeconomic areas, and that the Soviet economy is incapable of solving the problems related to developing new and modern kinds of weapons. I think that the knowledge of the broad masses of working people throughout the world about our economic potential is no less important than their knowledge about the essence of our foreign policy course and the peaceloving policy of the USSR and the socialist countries. To a certain degree the sereotype of the inability of the Soviet economy to cope with the increased tasks of scientific-technological progress, including those in the area of military equipment, must be refuted with a clear explanation of the real problems being solved by us at present.

It is not be accident that all socialist countries announced a transition to a course of intensivity and effectiveness. This concept contains great socioeconomic substance. The fact is that the USSR has accumulated a great economic potential that holds its groud vis-a-vis the U.S. potential. This is a potential of resources. We are equal in our resources, and I mean the basic stocks.

However, the volume of their use was limited until now. On this basis Reagan's administration speculated with the idea that the economy of the USSR and the socialist countries can be destabilized. I think that the entire system of the so-called sanctions is based on this basis -- the attempts to deprive us of Western technology, to close off our access to this technology, and thus to limit even more the possibilities of our economy. The speculation followed the following track: We cannot follow the path of intensive development. If they press us a little bit more, we shall encounter additional economic difficultires that will place us in a very difficult situation. I think that this slogan is preferred by Western propaganda, and even constitutes the basis of the political course of Reagan's administration in the international arena. When we speak of the imaginative attempts to achieve military superiority, we must also stress that the attempts to destablize the Soviet economy are equally imaginative because the hopes to exhaust our country from economic and social points of view are false.

... I would say so: Even in the new round of the arms race, imposed upon us after the appearance of cruise and Pershing II missiles in Europe, we shall do what is necessary so that our economic conditions do not deteriorate. We know how to do this.

U.S. ESTIMATE OF USSR DEFENSE BUDGET 'FOUL PLAY'

LD060209 Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] In the following commentary our observer Yuriy Soltan looks at discrepancies in reports on Soviet defense spending supplied by the Central Intelligence Agency and the Defense Department of the United States.

The CIA and the Pentagon are the sources that the White House turns to for information first thing, but sometimes they have trouble squaring their data as in the figures they cite about Soviet defense spending. The two departments are trying to outdo each other in falsifying this spending.

When the Soviet parliament was adopting a national budget in November of last year, it made no secret of the funds to be spent on various needs, including defense. This year defense spending accounts for 4.8 percent of the national budget, amounting to 17 billion rubles, the equivalent of about 22 billion U.S. dollars. It would be ridiculous to suggest that the CIA and the Pentagon do not know this, yet they claim that the Russians use different counting methods than Americans. Accordingly, the two departments make up a figure and leak it to the mass media.

Strangely enough, commentaries sometimes put Soviet defense spending at figures higher than the total Soviet budget. As a result of this foul play, many Westerners, Americans in particular, cannot get true information about the Soviet Union. The purpose is to stun the public with allegedly high Soviet defense spending and press for greater arms spending for the United States.

In the current fiscal year that began in the United States on 1 October it is to spend over 280 billion dollars on military needs. According to the ASSOCIATED PRESS, the Pentagon chief, Caspar Weinberger, wanted the sum to be 351 billion dollars next year. This being so, various American departments, above all the Pentagon and the CIA, are using falsehoods in a bid to justify the militaristic rush of the Reagan administration. In an effort to appear impartial and independent they engineer public debates, but the truth is that the Soviet Union has never spent and will never spend a single ruble more on defense than is absolutely necessary to ensure its security and that of its friends and allies.

This country will be able to do everything necessary to maintain the military strategic balance that Washington is trying so hard to upset. However, we would not like to follow this path.

As the Soviet leader Yuriy Andropov put it in his statement of the 24th of last month, the Soviet Union is convinced that peace can be strengthened and international security guaranteed not by building up and inventing ever new regions, but on the contrary by reducing the existing weapons to immeasurably lower levels than now. The Soviet Union has always worked for this and will continue to do so in the future.

'UPSURGE' SEEN IN U.S. NUCLEAR FREEZE MOVEMENT

LD060211 Moscow TASS in English 2113 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] New York December 5 TASS -- The anti-war movement in the United States is on the upsurge. A new nation-wide anti-war organisation "Freeze Voter-84" started functioning in the United States.

It has been created on the initiative of members of the leadership and activities of the nation-wide nuclear weapon freeze campaign. The main task of the organisation is to involve American peace champions ever wider in the election campaign in the United States, to make problems of the curbing of the arms race, freezing nuclear arsenals and the prevention of nuclear catastrophe priority problems in the election campaign.

Three important public organisations -- Physicians for Social Responsibility, the Union of Concerned Scientists and the Alliance of Lawyers for Nuclear Arms Control have created a new organisation, the Professionals' Coalition for Nuclear Arms Control. The coalition will shortly start implementing a range of political actions which must result in bringing a strong influence of the anti-war movement on the outcome of the 1984 election campaign in the United States.

CANADIAN CP 'CONDEMNS' U.S. INF DEPLOYMENT

LD061057 Moscow TASS in English 1034 GMT 6 Dec 83

[Text] Ottawa December 6 TASS -- The plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Canada has come to a close in Toronto. The plenum discussed matters connected with the determination of the party's strategy at the forthcoming parliamentary elections as well as the tasks of the Canadian Communists in the struggle for peace.

The main report at the plenary meeting was delivered by William Kashtan, general secretary of the Communist Party of Canada. He strongly condemned the started deployment of new U.S. nuclear weapons in Western Europe and laid the entire blame for the deterioration of the international situation on the USA and NATO. Having noted the principled and consistent character of the Soviet Union's foreign policy course, the leader of the Canadian Communists pointed out that peaceful coexistence, detente and disarmament based on the principle of parity and equal security remain the invariable goal of the policy of the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community.

The plenum unanimously endorsed the Communist Party's line towards combining the struggle for socio-economic interests and democratic rights of the Canadian working people, against a swing to the right in the internal political situation, with the struggle for peace, for an independent foreign policy of Canada, against the Reagan administration's aggressive course which threatens the world with a nuclear catastrophe.

WU XUEQIAN REMARKS ON USSR, U.S. MISSILES SCORED

PM051702 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Petrov article: "Tendentious Utterances"]

[Text] The newspaper RENMIN RIBAO has published a XINHUA report on a press conference given by PRC Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian in the Japanese city of Nagasaki. The minister touched, in particular, on the problems of medium-range weapons in Europe. His treatment of this question, of utmost importance in the development of the contemporary international situation, proved very far from being an analysis of the real reasons behind the wrecking of the Geneva talks through the fault of the U.S. Administration and of the real emerging threat of a new round in the nuclear missile arms race.

The Chinese minister sees the essence of the problem as "intensification of the confrontation between the two nuclear superpowers on the question of the siting of Soviet SS-20 missiles in Europe," thus de facto exonerating the United States of responsibility for attempts to disrupt the military-strategic equilibrium in Europe and attain nuclear superiority over the USSR.

Hence his distorted evaluation of the mass demonstrations by the West European public against the stationing of U.S. "Pershings" and cruise missiles. According to Wu Xueqian, it seems the antiwar movement in West European countries is aimed not against the siting of new U.S. missiles that has started on those states' territory but against "actions by the two superpowers."

Diverting attention from the very dangerous steps being taken by the Reagan administration for siting U.S. nuclear first-strike means in Europe, the PRC minister also "fails to notice" the efforts made by the United States and its allies to turn the Far East region into yet another deployment line for new U.S. nuclear missiles targeted at the USSR and other socialist countries of Asia, and alludes to China's and Japan's common "concern" over Soviet missiles in the Far East.

The logical question arises: Is it really permissible to ignore the true sources of the growing military danger, whose roots lie in sharply intensified adventurism of the most reactionary circles of imperialism, and to attempt -- under the guise of "impartiality" -- to distort the peace-loving and antiwar nature and goals of the policy of the land of the soviets and of the socialist community?

GOODS TRANSPORT LINES WITH PRC RESUMED

LD031657 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 3 Dec 83

[Text] Drivers of Sovtransavto [Soviet motor transport] have begun work on a new international line. (Valeriy Semenovich Sinkov), chairman of the association, talks about it in an interview with our correspondent.

[Begin Sinkov recording] Quite recently we were on the border of the PRC, in the area of Khorgos. This is not far from Alma Ata. In this region transportation of foreign trade goods by Sovtransavto motor vehicles is being resumed. The first batch of goods vehicles was handed over for the PRC. Apart from these vehicles, we handed over -- for the transportation of foreign trade goods -- 55 goods vehicles which will deliver to the PRC foreign trade goods: construction materials, equipment, and other loads. Consumer goods will come from the PRC.

A motor transport enterprise for international transportation is being built in the town of Taldy-kurgan, the Kazakh SSR. A transhipment base is also being created there. Warehouse premises and a large concrete area are also being built on Chinese territory; an administration building is being built for the transport forwarding firm of Sinotrans.

[Unidentified correspondent] (Valeriy Semenovich), this is the first line with the PRC on which you have resumed work.

[Sinkov] In the future we will have to open up another line from the Kirghiz SSR. This will also be a line to serve the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region, but the direction will be from Rybach'ye to the border in the region of Torugart. [end recording]

PRC TRANSLATORS OF USSR LITERARY WORKS AWARDED

OW051045 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1230 GMT 3 Dec 83

[Text] The International Meeting of Translators of Literary Works of Russia and the USSR ended in Moscow. Delegates from 35 Oriental and occidental countries attended this meeting. Guo Baoquan and (Ge Gaoang), well-known Chinese translators, together with other translators of literary works from Russia and the USSR, were awarded honor certificates of merit by the board of the USSR Union of Writers. Secretary of the Board Ozerov presented the awards at the closing meeting.

The Chinese translators introduced some works by authors from Russia and the USSR which had been translated into Chinese and exhibited some of the translated works. They pointed out that the translation of literary works from Russia and the USSR not only helps promote cultural exchange but also enhances friendship between the people of China and the USSR.

U.S., NOT USSR, 'THREATENING' ASIAN REGION

PM051352 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Dec 83 Second Edition p 3

[A. Matveyev article under the rubric "Remarks Apropos": "Who is Threatening the Region"]

[Text] The world press is continuing to comment extensively on the results of the U.S. President's visit to Japan and South Korea. Many observers are stressing that what can be quite clearly seen behind Reagan's discourses on "the great future of the Asian and Pacific region" is Washington's desire to establish U.S. hegemony there.

Washington intends to secure these claims by relying on military force. And this has been repeatedly stressed by the U.S. President and other U.S. leaders. It was no accident that General J. Vessey, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, left for the Far East literally straight after Reagan. News agencies point out that his talks in Tokyo and Seoul examined specific military programs aimed at the qualitative strengthening both of the Japanese and South Korean Armed Forces and of the U.S. troops stationed in those countries.

The second biggest U.S. Armed Forces grouping abroad is in the Pacific. The Pentagon has recently been implementing a broad program to strengthen this grouping's might. Thus Tomahawk cruise missiles will be added to the nuclear weapons already deployed aboard ships of the U.S. Pacific Fleet. It is proposed to install the same missiles, in the ground-launched version this time, on Japanese and South Korean territory. Questions of the siting of the new U.S. nuclear weapons, the press attests, were among the main questions at Reagan's talks in Tokyo and Seoul.

And in order to hitch these two countries even more strongly to its military chariot, Washington is pushing ahead with the creation of a trilateral United States-Japan-South Korea militarist bloc. During his visit the U.S. President put forward far-reaching plans for creating some kind of "Pacific alliance," which, all the indications are, is also to be an instrument of U.S. imperial policy in the region.

Washington's aggressive policy in the Asian and Pacific region is also reflected in the U.S. ruling circles' numerous attempts to use the language of diktat with the Asian countries and to flout their sovereignty. One need only recall, for instance, the threats Reagan showered on the DPRK. And the U.S. President's trip into the region of the demilitarized zone was overtly provocative. The "Taiwan resolution" recently adopted by a Senate Committee of the U.S. Congress can be explained by the same imperial approach. It asserts with brazen effrontery that the future of Taiwan, this integral part of Chinese territory, will be decided "in accordance with laws passed by the U.S. Congress," no less.

Washington tries to justify its desire for U.S. hegemony in the Asian and Pacific region by the need to "defend" the region's countries from an alleged "Soviet military threat." U.S. politicians and figures in the countries that obediently toe Washington's line are not averse to resorting to this hackneyed device. Take, for instance, a speech by Japanese Foreign Minister S. Abe, who asserted that Asian people are allegedly concerned at "the Soviet Union's buildup of its military might." It is not hard to understand these tricks.

What is incomprehensible is something else. Items have recently begun appearing in certain press organs in Asian countries which, contrary to the self-evident facts, allege that the USSR is "exacerbating the situation" and intensifying its military might in the region, while the U.S. actions are purely "retaliatory."

These allegations are clearly at variance with the true state of affairs. Furthermore, it is quite obvious that the intensification of military presence and the buildup of U.S. arms, including nuclear missile arms, is a direct threat not only to the Soviet Union but also to all the countries of the region.

JAPANESE BUSINESSMEN HOLD TRADE TALKS IN MOSCOW

LD052058 Moscow TASS in English 1159 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow December 5 TASS -- Soviet-Japanese talks have started in Moscow today. They are attended by a delegation of the Japanese business circles headed by vice-president of the Osaka Chamber of Commerce and Industry Kamataro Kondo. The delegation includes presidents, managers, directors and heads of export-import departments of firms of the Kansai industrial region of which Osaka is the centre.

Members of the Japanese delegation will hold talks at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade and Soviet Foreign Trade Associations, including "Techmashimport", "Mashpriborintorg", "Techsnabexport", "Promsyripimport" "Sojuzpromexport" and "Machinoimport". Japanese businessmen will also take part in a Soviet-Japanese seminar, which will deal with the state and prospects of the development of bilateral scientific, technical, trade and economic ties.

PATOLICHEV SIGNS TRADE PROTOCOL WITH MONGOLIA

LD030346 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 2 Dec 83

[Text] A protocol was signed in Moscow today on trade turnover between the Soviet Union and Mongolia for next year. A further increase of reciprocal deliveries of goods is planned. The USSR will supply Mongolia with various machines, equipment, transport means, petroleum products, metals, fertilizers and other materials to provide for the working of the republic's industry. In its turn the Mongolian People's Republic will supply us with cooper and molybdenum concentrates, fluorspar, woolen knitwear, carpets, sheepskin articles and other goods. The protocol was signed by Patolichev, USSR minister of foreign trade, and Ochir, Mongolia's minister of foreign trade.

WPK PLENUM DISCUSSES DPRK ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

PM051444 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 83 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Razuvayev dispatch: "Workers Party of Korea Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 2 Dec -- The Eighth Workers Party of Korea [WPK] Central Committee Plenum has been held here to discuss the DPRK national economic development plan for 1984. Hong Song-yong, vice premier of the Administration Council and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee, delivered the report on this question. Organizational questions were also considered. The plenum elected Ho Tam, candidate member of the WPK Central Committee Politburo and vice premier of the Administration Council, to full membership of the WPK Central Committee Politburo. An Sung-hak, secretary of the WPK Central Committee, and Hong Song-yong and Kim Pok-sin, vice premiers of the Administration Council, were elected candidate members of the WPK Central Committee Politburo. Kim Il-song, general secretary of the WPK central Committee and president of the DPRK, participated in the plenum's work.

DRA STATEMENT ON U.S. 'INTERFERENCE' CITED

LD060808 Moscow TASS in English 0759 GMT 06 Dec 83

[Text] Kabul December 6 TASS -- Following is a statement of the Government of the DRA, issued by BAKHTAR news agency:

Reports coming lately about the aggravation of the tensions in various parts of the world, e.g., Europe, Middle East, Central America and Caribbean region are a cause of serious concern.

The U.S. imperialism has launched open aggression against the forces of peace and social progress. The Reagan administration tries to cover up its actions by false propaganda about the so-called "defence of the rights of mankind" or supporting the American nationals inhabiting this or that country and shamelessly sheds the blood of innocent people. The U.S. imperialism had resorted to such actions in Vietnam and now openly practises the same in Grenada, El Salvador, Lebanon and some other countries of the world.

The criminal undeclared imperialist war against DRA which has been continuing for more than five years is one of the examples of aggressive character of American imperialism. The heroic people of Afghanistan who have chosen the way of building a new society in the country under the leadership of PDPA are compelled to struggle heroically against counter-revolution which is encouraged, financed, supported and armed by Washington and from the centres of some other countries and to put best of their manpower to this task.

Now a most dangerous situation has emerged around Nicaragua, and Washington is preparing a major armed invasion of that country using contingents of regular armed forces of Honduras, and Guatemala with the direct participation of traitors of Somoza bands and the U.S. Army.

These actions of American militarists which are part of the general adventuristic plan of Washington is a great and open threat and danger not only to the people of Nicaragua but also for socialist Cuba, other countries of Latin America and national liberation movements in other parts of the world. The actions of White House policy makers and their hegemonistic and expansionist policies reveal clearly the hostile character of imperialism towards other people and humanity as a whole.

DRA PREMIER INTERVIEWED ON USSR-DRA RELATIONS

PM061047 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Dec 83 First Edition p 5

[Interview with Soltan Ali Keshtmand, chairman of the DRA Council of Ministers, by APN and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA correspondent A. Sukhoparov: "Example of Good-Neighborliness"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Kabul -- In connection with the fifth anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Afghan Treaty on Friendship, Good-Neighborliness, and Cooperation Soltan Ali Keshtmand, chairman of the DRA Council of Ministers, answers our correspondent's questions.

Question: Comrade Keshtmand, Soviet-Afghan relations are frequently called traditional. Indeed, their history already goes back almost 65 years. What new things have happened in them over the past 5 years, since the signing of the Treaty on Friendship, Good-Neighborliness, and Cooperation between our two countries?

Answer: You will probably not find many states in the world today with such long-standing friendly and immutable good-neighborly relations as Afghanistan and the Soviet Union. They stem from such important historic events as the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the formation of the world's first worker-peasant state, and the restoration of Afghanistan's full political independence. Our people recall with sincere gratitude the fact that the land of Lenin was the first to recognize Afghanistan's sovereignty and independence and extended to them the hand of friendship and assistance in the struggle against the British colonialists. The independent Afghan state concluded the first equitable treaty with Soviet Russia in 1921.

After the April 1978 revolution in Afghanistan, which is of an antifeudal, anti-imperialist, liberation, national democratic nature, relations between our countries rose to a qualitatively new level. They have now become relations of sincere profound friendship, fraternal cooperation, and revolutionary solidarity. The treaty concluded in Moscow on 5 December 1978 is a historic document. It was signed in full accordance with the national interests of the two countries' peoples and the aims and principles of the UN Charter, and it not only is not directed against any third states but, on the contrary, is an important step in strengthening peace and security both in our region and on the entire Asian Continent.

Our government and the Afghan people rate highly and support the Soviet Union's indefatigable efforts maintain and strengthen the detente process, consolidate world peace and security, and end the unrestrained arms race conducted by American imperialism and its NATO allies. The recent statement by Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, attests once again to the consistency and immutability of the Soviet Union's peace-loving policy and its determination to continue to do everything to protect mankind from the threatening danger and to stop those who are pushing the world toward nuclear catastrophe. This policy meets with the approval and support of progressive forces all over the world, including in our country.

Question: The development of economic ties and trade is rightly called one of the foundations of Soviet-Afghan cooperation. What influence has the conclusion of the treaty had on this sphere of relations between the two countries?

Answer: I would like, first of all, to emphasize that the treaty creates favorable conditions for the development of economic and trade cooperation between our neighboring states on a sound long-term and planned basis and makes it possible to take the interests and needs of the DRA and USSR national economies more fully into account. Within the framework of our cooperation it is planned to construct in Afghanistan approximately 170 different national economic projects, of which 80 have already been commissioned and are working successfully.

The USSR is currently giving the DRA assistance in constructing and operating 85 projects in transportation, industry, power generation, communications, agriculture, irrigation, and public health, in prospecting for and exploiting mineral deposits, and in training national cadres. Over the past 2 years alone a transshipment base and a railroad station have been constructed at (Khayraton) through the joint efforts of the two countries' construction workers and specialists, as has a road bridge over the Amudarya. In addition, a (Lotos) space communication station, a compressor station on the Khodzha Gugurdak gas field, a motor transport enterprise to service Kamaz trucks, and other projects have been commissioned.

Today more than 5,000 highly skilled specialists, trained both in Soviet VUZ'es and technical colleges and in DRA educational institutions set up with Soviet assistance, are working in DRA industrial enterprises and state establishments. Approximately 70,000 skilled Afghan workers have been trained at Afghan-Soviet economic cooperation projects.

Trade between the two countries is also developing successfully. Trade turnover has increased more than 200 percent over the past 5 years. The USSR is rightly considered Afghanistan's major trading partner. Approximately half the Soviet exports to our country are machinery and industrial-transport equipment. In addition, the Soviet Union supplies the DRA with important commodities for the national economy, such as petroleum products, rolled ferrous metals, chemicals, and also consumer goods.

The DRA in turn supplies the USSR with natural gas and carbamide. Cotton, wool, rawhide, citrus fruits, olives, dried fruits, and nuts occupy a significant place in exports to the Soviet Union. Trade between our countries is conducted on the basis of 5-year agreements -- which imparts to it a regular, stable nature. The current agreement for the period 1981-1985 provides for an approximate trebling of trade turnover compared with the previous 5-year period.

Question: In the West, as well as in certain countries in the region, a campaign is continuing over the presence of the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan. Attempts are made to pass it off as the chief cause of the tension around Afghanistan. What could you say about this?

Answer: Such groundless statements really can be encountered frequently in the Western press and also in certain politicians' speeches. They are used to exaggerate the notorious "Soviet threat" myth and to justify the unrestrained arms race and the adventurist militarist policy being pursued by the present U.S. Administration and its NATO partners. Here they totally ignore the actual state of affairs and the fact that the limited contingent of Soviet troops was invited by the legitimate Government of Afghanistan to render assistance in repulsing the external threat hanging over it.

The action taken by the DRA and the USSR is exclusively defensive in nature and conditioned by the extreme need to suppress resolutely and forever any armed or other interference by external forces hostile to Afghanistan. This joint action is legitimate and empowered by law, since it fully accords with the spirit and letter of the Treaty on Friendship, Good-Neighborliness, and Cooperation of 5 December 1978, as well as international law -- in particular article 51 of the UN Charter. This proclaims: "The Charter in no way impairs the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense" for the purpose of repelling aggression. Now that the American aggressors, having flouted all international laws, have dealt mercilessly with independent Grenada, now that the threat of their armed invasion hangs over Nicaragua, and now that the American military is committing excesses in Lebanon, we have once again been convinced of the expediency and timeliness of the step we took to protect our country's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Realistic and comprehensive plans for achieving a political settlement of the situation which has taken shape around Afghanistan were announced in detail in our statements of 14 May 1980 and 24 August 1981. As for the presence of the limited contingent of Soviet troops on Afghan territory, this is a matter exclusively within the competence of our two countries. We have repeatedly declared that this contingent will be withdrawn when the reasons that entailed inviting it to the DRA have ceased to exist, that is, when external armed interference in Afghanistan's affairs has totally ceased and reliable guarantees that something similar will not be repeated in the future have been provided.

We are sincerely grateful to the Soviet Union for its internationalist assistance and support and are firmly confident that the course of friendship, good-neighborliness, and cooperation which our countries are following will remain unchanged.

NURIYEV ATTENDS MOSCOW DRA TREATY COMMEMORATION

PM060938 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Solemn Meeting"]

[Text] The signing of the USSR-DRA Treaty on Friendship, Good-Neighborliness, and Cooperation was an act further deepening the international brotherhood, solidarity, and multifaceted cooperation between the peoples of the two countries. This was stressed at a 2 December solemn meeting of representatives of the Moscow public devoted to the fifth anniversary of the document.

The keynote speaker -- S.F. Antonov, chairman of the Central Board of the Society for Friendship and Cultural Links With Afghanistan and a USSR minister -- noted that the document has become a reliable instrument in the struggle for peace and stability in Asia and throughout the world and in the cause of defending the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the DRA.

S. Mangel, head of the Afghan-Soviet Friendship Society delegation and deputy chairman of the DRA Council of Ministers, declared that the Afghan people are firmly resolved to defend the gains of the April Revolution, which has brought their country genuine independence and social progress. Afghanistan's successes in developing its economy and culture would have been impossible without the all-around aid of the USSR and the other socialist countries.

The guest stressed the great importance of the consistent activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state and the statement by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov in the struggle for peace and for averting the danger of nuclear war.

Taking part in the meeting were B. Yazkuliyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Z.N. Nuriyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; the leaders of a number of ministries and departments; representatives of the party, soviet, and public organizations; and H. Mangal, DRA ambassador to the USSR.

KARMAL SPEAKS IN KABUL ON FRIENDSHIP WITH USSR

LD042107 Moscow TASS in English 1958 GMT 4 Dec 83

[Text] Kabul December 4 TASS -- Relations between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union are deep rooted. The foundation of friendship between the peoples in the two countries was laid by the great Vladimir I. Lenin, leader of the world proletariat, Babrak Karmal today told a ceremony on receiving a congratulatary message from the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR on the occasion of the 5th anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship, Goodneighborliness, and Cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. All legislative acts and treaties signed by the two countries are of immense importance. Of particular significance is the 1921 treaty that endorsed reciprocal readiness to help ensure and strengthen Afghanistan's independence.

The Soviet Union's selfless and comprehensive assistance has been of great importance for consolidating Afghanistan's independence, especially in the economic sphere.

The USSR helped build in Afghanistan 175 economic projects which are playing a great part in developing all spheres of Afghan economy. A great number of projects are being built.

The people of Afghanistan, the party and the Government of the Democratic Republic cordially thank the heroic people of the Soviet Union, the CPSU, the Leninist Central Committee, the Soviet Government and the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet for the selfless backing rendered to Afghanistan since the April Revolution.

At the present stage, international reactionaries, counter-revolutionaries and sections and classes who had dominated in the country are now trying to put an end to Afghanistan's independence and destroy its liberation movement with assistance from imperialism led by the United States and regional reactionaries. They are also aiming to jeopardize peace in the region and all over the world. It is these dark forces of reaction that worked out the criminal plans of partitioning Afghanistan and starting a war which would spill over to the entire region and would threaten peace in Asia on the whole. These forces, taking advantage of the situation around Afghanistan and acting contrary to the principles of independence and the right of all states to free and independent development are continuing interference in Afghan affairs.

"Despite all that, we will build a free, prosperous, independent Afghanistan, we will protect the gains of the April Revolution. We will build a new society, free from exploitation of man by man, a society of equality, of free work for all the peoples and nationalities of our motherland," Babrak Karmal stressed.

SARBOLAND APPLAUDS USSR AID AT KABUL MEETING

PM051206 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Standing Guard Over the Revolution and National Independence"]

[Text] Kabul, 2 Dec -- A ceremonial meeting to mark the fifth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty on Friendship, Good-Neighborliness, and Cooperation between the USSR and the DRA was held 1 December in the Afghan capital. Taking part were members of the PDPA Central Committee Politburo and PDPA Central Committee, ministers of the DRA Government, members of the diplomatic corps, and representatives of the Afghan public.

A.M. Sarboland, deputy chairman of the DRA Council of Ministers, member of the PDPA Central Committee, and member of the DRA Revolutionary Council, addressed the meeting. The events of the past 5 years, he said, show that the Treaty on Friendship, Good-Neighborliness, and Cooperation between the two fraternal countries is a guarantee of the conservation of Afghanistan's territorial integrity and sovereignty and a guarantee of the ultimate victory of the April Revolution. After the revolution had been accomplished, he said, world reaction launched a broad offensive with a view to destabilizing the situation in Afghanistan. It was this period which saw the start of the practical operations by the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force in the Near East, the reinforcement of U.S. military bases in the Indian Ocean region, and preparation for an attack on Afghanistan. With all its might and prestige the USSR has been an obstacle on the path of implementing these plans, A.M. Sarboland stressed. The conclusion of the 1978 treaty opened a new page in the history of relations between the two countries.

The USSR's economic aid to the DRA has become even broader and more comprehensive, as a result of which favorable conditions have emerged for overcoming Afghanistan's centuries-old backwardness and improving the lives of the broad working masses.

"Relations between our countries right now are at a supreme level of fraternity and full mutual understanding," the deputy chairman of the DRA Council of Ministers said. He assessed highly the Soviet Union's role in defending the DRA's national independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity. "We view the Soviet Union's aid and support to our country as a supreme example of international solidarity," A. M. Sarboland said.

The present anniversary of the Treaty on Friendship, Good-Neighborliness, and Cooperation between the two countries has coincided with the start of the deployment of the new U.S. missiles in Western Europe by the United States and its NATO allies, the speaker continued. The U.S. Administration is doing everything to heat up the international atmosphere as much as possible. "We in Afghanistan express our full support for the statement by Y. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chariman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and we are sure that, in advancing specific constructive proposals with a view to safeguarding peace and international security, the Soviet Union is following its principled position -- its position as the standard-bearer of peace."

The meeting was also addressed by A. A. Khomyakov, member of the CPSU Central Committee, first secretary of the Tambov party obkom, and leader of the Soviet delegation in Kabul for the celebrations. On behalf of the Soviet people, the USSR leadership and Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, personally, he conveyed to those taking part in the meeting and through them to the entire friendly fraternal Afghan people the warmest and most cordial wishes in connection with the notable date. He noted that the 1978 treaty gave powerful new impetus to the further development and consolidation of relations between the USSR and the DRA. It is helping to defend Afghanistan's sovereignty and territorial integrity in the face of the dangerous intrigues of the forces of imperialism and reaction and is a reliable factor of peace in the region and in Asia as a whole.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA ON USSR-DRA TREATY ANNIVERSARY

PM060955 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA In Russian 3 Dec 83 Second Editon p 5

[Lieutenant Colonel O. Cherneta article: "Friendship and Good-Neighborliness: On the Fifth Anniversary of Soviet-Afghan Treaty"]

[Text] December 5, 1983, is the fifth anniversary of the signing in Moscow of the Treaty of Friendship, Good-Neighborliness, and Copperation between the USSR and the DRA. This treaty is an important political document,which not only promotes the steady development of Soviet-Afghan relations, but also meets the interests of strengthening peace and security in Asia and throughout the world.

The 1978 treaty reaffirmed allegiance to the ideals and principles of the Soviet-Afghan treaties of 1921 and 1931, which laid the foundation for friendly and good-neighborly relations between the Soviet and Afghan peoples and which were in line with their fundamental national interests. The foundation of equal relations between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Afghanistan was laid by the founder of the world's first socialist state -- V. I. Lenin.

In his 28 April 1921 message to Amir Amanullah Khan, Vladimir Ilich wrote: "The high Afghan state was one of the first states whose representatives we joyfully met in Moscow, and we are happy to note that the first friendship treaty the Afghan people concluded was their treaty with Russia.

"We are confident that our sincerest wish will come to pass and that Russia will always be the first friend of the high Afghan state, to the benefit of both peoples."

More than 60 years have elapsed since that time. The tradition of friendship and good-neighborliness is now being continued with Democratic Afghanistan. As a result of the victory of the April Revolution, effected under the leadership of the PDPA in 1978, and the establishment of people's power in the country, Soviet-Afghan relations have entered a qualitatively new stage in their development, have been filled with new content, and are typified by a spirit of comradeship and revolutionary solidarity.

On Afghan soil there is much wonderful evidence of the historic friendship between our peoples. There are thousands of kilometers of modern highways, power stations providing around 60 percent of the country's power industry capacities, major irrigation systems, various industrial enterprises, and gasfields and oilfields.

In brief, as envisaged in the Treaty of Friendship, Good-Neighborliness, and Cooperation, the Soviet Union is providing the DRA with all-around effective help in developing its national economy and culture. At the same time the Soviet Union is helping the people of Afghanistan in the struggle to build a new society and in the defense of the gains of the April Revolution and the country's independence and sovereignty from outside aggression.

It is well known that immediately after the victory of the April Revolution the forces of imperialism and regional reaction unleashed an undeclared war against Democratic Afghanistan. And the interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs constantly increased. It became particularly menacing in summer and fall 1979, when continuous large-scale armed intervention created a real threat that Afghanistan would lose its independence and be transformed into an imperialist military bridgehead on our country's southern border.

In these conditions, the Soviet Union could not fail to respond to the repeated requests of the Government of friendly Afghanistan. The principles of fraternal solidarity determined our country's stance, including the introduction of a limited military contingent into Afghanistan in 1979. In taking this decision, the USSR proceeded from the common interests of the two countries in security questions as enshrined in the Treaty of Friendship, Good-Neighborliness, and Cooperation and from the interests of maintaining peace in that region.

The Soviet internationalist servicemen on DRA territory are a reliable shield against imperialist interference. This has enabled the Afghan people to concentrate their efforts on resolving the tasks of liquidating the bandit formations and on implementing plans designed to guarantee the people a peaceful life, and to pay greater attention to their vital needs and interests.

At present, the Afghan people are courageously combating the forces of internal and external reaction under the PDPA's leadership. Following the party's appeal "to rally still more closely together to finally smash the counterrevolution," a unified, collective system for the defense of the revolution is being created in the DRA in light of the decisions of the first PDPA National Conference (March 1982).

It involves close cooperation among military units, the people's militia, the security organs, the detachments for defense of the revolution, the tribal militia, and territorial civil defense formations.

As the PDPA action program adopted in March 1982 stresses, the Armed Forces are a crucial element in this system for achieving victory over counterrevolution. The party and Government of the DRA pay constant attention to strengthening them and improving their combat capability, combat readiness, and level of technical equipment. Afghan servicement are educated in a spirit of devotion to the ideals of national-democratic revolution. The discussion of these problems occupied a central place in the first All-Army Conference of PDPA Primary rganization Secretaries, held in mid-November this year.

Thanks to the adopted measures it has been possible to defeat large gangs and clear them from many of the country's population centers, Hundreds of rebels, realizing that they have been deceived, want to return to their families and peaceful labor. The PDPA Central Committee, the DRA Revolutionary Council, and the DRA Government are meeting these people halfway. A law on amnesty has been promulgated. Recently the ringleaders of many gangs have been embarking on talks with representatives of the authorities and leaving the armed struggle against the people's system. In addition, great efforts are being made to overcome the influence of hostile propaganda, which still remains in the consciousness of some of the population.

This year definite successes have been achieved in the development of the country's economy. Industry has started to work more steadily. More electricity, coal, fertilizers, cement, and other products have been produced A good harvest of grain crops, vegetables, and fruits has been gathered.

In celebrating the fifth anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship, Good-Neighborliness, and Cooperation, all Soviet people express their solidarity with the Afghan people's struggle against the unceasing imperialist interference in their country's affairs, support the DRA Government's efforts to achieve a just and all-embracing political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan, and wish the Afghan people and their servicemen new successes in the struggle to implement the aims and tasks of the national-democratic revolution.

DRA'S SALANG HIGHWAY EXEMPLIFIES USSR FRIENDSHIP

LD052337 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] [Leshchinskiy] It is now 5 years since the Friendship Treaty between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan was concluded. Our correspondent in Afghanistan, Vladimir Fadeyev, has devoted this next report to that date -- over to Kabul:

[Fadeyev] There's an unusual map of the country in the State Planning Committee of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. It shows with colored bulbs the Soviet-Afghan economic and technical cooperation projects already in operation as well as those under construction. There are 175 projects that have been built with our country's aid which are currently operating. At the moment there are fewer under construction, because the undeclared war unleashed by the imperialists, with U.S. imperialism at its head, has made its somber amendments to the peaceful plans of the Afghan people. The timetable for putting into operation many projects of enormous importance for the economy of this developing country has been put back.

On this map of projects in operation there is one that strikes the eye immediately, a string of little lights linking the city and port of Hayratan, which is situated in the north of the country, on the very bank of the Amu Darya, with Kabul. What's more, the dotted line on the map is broken in one place, near the spot where the relief of the Hindu Kush range is marked. Here the road dives into a long tunnel which has been driven through the rock at a height of 3,700 metres. That is what the Salang Highway looks like on this map, the highway which has rightly been called the main road in the country. There are no railways in Afghanistan; there are no river or sea routes. The whole volume of freight transportation is carried out by motor transport here. As is known, modern roads are essential for this.

The Salang Highway was designed by Soviet specialists, and it was also built with the participation of hundreds of road-building workers from different parts of our country. And the dozens of protective galleries and hairpin bends and the tunnel itself have been constructed by Soviet underground railway builders. The road along which freight and passengers are mainly carried has already been operating for more than 11 years. But perhaps I should give yet another figure: The length of this route is 400 km. It might be said that this is not such a long way. Yes, it is not very long, if one is to judge by the number of kilometers. But the drivers of the vehicles who have mastered this road here in Afghanistan belong to a special stock of people: Snow on the pass does not melt even in summer, and in winter snowdrifts and avalanches, under temperatures of minus forty degrees, are common affairs.

Dushmans frequently stage ambushes among the rocks and on the hairpin bends. Vehicles in convoy with holes in their bodies or cabins are also a common sight. So you be the judge after this: Is the 400-km road a long one, if on the other end there are goods and cargo for the capital, for the province; if the route ensures that Afghan export goods for our country and for other other world states are brought out; if it brings in oil products, footwear, machine tools, timber, paper, metals, sugar, and other goods needed by the Afghan people?

Talking about the road, one cannot fail to mention the vehicles. Quite recently, and even currently, this route has been full of trucks which are in the main antediluvian, belonging to private owners. But they are receding into the past and making room increasingly for modern Maz, Kamaz, and Tatra vehicles. These vehicles are registered as belonging to state motor-transport organizations. At the moment there are still not very many of these organizations but they are determining the face of the country's transport base.

Soviet specialists handing on their experience to their Afghan friends, are working in workshops alongside Afghan workers on the outskirts of Kabul, where the blocks of a motor-transport enterprise have been given a cosy setting at the foothills of the mountains. They conduct the training on vehicle driver courses, on courses for fitters and repair workers, for lathe-operators and others. Here I was introduced to one of the best drivers of the enterprise, Sayed (Wali). When the enterprise was still being built, he received Kamaz No 1. This was the first vehicle in a consignment of trucks received by the enterprise. This is what Sayed (Wali) told me:

[Begin recording -- Sayed (Wali) in Dari with superimposed Russian translation] I work as a Kamaz driver, says Sayed (Wali). Soviet friendship vehicles, as we call them, have been working on the Salang highway for several years. Along this road we deliver cargo across the pass into Kabul. Our work is also a result of cooperation between the two countries. Only the warmest words can be said about it. And today I want to express a big thank-you for the aid that we feel every day, and for the benefits which the friendship objectives are bringing to thousands of Afghans. [end recording]

KARMAL DISCUSSES DRA NATIONALITIES QUESTION

LD022153 Moscow TASS in English 1640 GMT 2 Dec 83

[Text] Kabul December 2 TASS -- Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, president of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, received delegates to the recent jirgah (council) of figures who had played a prominent part in the political life of Afghanistan before the April Revolution of 1978.

The setting up of jirgahs, Babrak Karmal emphasised, was a vehicle for establishing true democracy in the country. The Afghan leader noted that necessary measures had been taken in the country to guarantee the legitimate rights of all nationalities and tribes, to ensure their social, economic and cultural development. Babrak Karmal emphasised that precisely that idea underlied the effort to solve the nationalities question in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

ARKHIPOV ARRIVES IN DELHI FOR COOPERATION TALKS

LD060218 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2006 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] Delhi, 5 Dec (TASS) -- Ivan Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, has arrived here on an official visit. He will take part in the eighth session of the intergovernmental Soviet-Indian Commission on Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation, of which he is cochairman. The session opens here tomorrow.

In connection with the forthcoming session, the Indian cochairman of the commission, P.V. Narasimha Rao, Indian minister of external affairs, said in an interview given to TASS correspondent Vladimir Baydashin:

Relations between our countries are developing well and in a stable manner. In the present difficult international situation, great responsibility lies with the Soviet Union and India, as with all countries of the world. It is essential to curb the whipping up of international tension, to reduce it in every possible way, and create as far as is possible a climate of better understanding.

BANGLADESH ARMY 'DISSATISFACTION' WITH REGIME NOTED

PM021331 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Akhmedzyanov dispatch: "Bangladesh: Opposition In Favor of Changes"]

[Text] Delhi -- THE TIMES OF INDIA correspondent in Dhaka reports that a strike has been called in Bangladesh's largest port, Chittagong, which has spread to other cities in the country. The strike has been called following an appeal by Bangladesh's 22 opposition parties as a sign of protest against the maltreatment organized by the country's military administration against participants in mass demonstrations in Dhaka. It is well known that 4 people were killed and about 400 injured during these demonstrations.

All state offices, stores, and education establishments in Chittagong are closed. Railroad traffic has stopped and flights by aircraft of the national airline have been cancelled. Following the introduction of a curfew in Dhaka the streets are relatively quiet but, according to the newspaper, an "ominous calm" has set in before renewed struggle. Mass arrests have began in the city. The police and troops have already arrested over 600 persons since Monday. All activity by political parties is banned. The last wave of repression resulted in the arrest of 150 persons, including the opposition parties' leaders.

The opposition parties have demanded that the presidential election set for next May be held after the parliamentary election. The dissatisfaction among higher army officers with the regime is a new development of events in the last few days. The regime's head, General Ershad, fearing that the army may join the popular demonstrations, has visited three garrisons where he delivered speeches accusing the opposition of "antinational activities." In order to enlist support from outside, General Ershad is openly courting the Western countries. Despite the persecution, the wave of the movement to liquidate the military regime is undiminished in the country.

AUSTRALIANS 'UNHAPPY' OVER U.S. BASES' 'THREAT'

PM051508 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 4

[V. Volodin "International Notes": Anxiety on the Fifth Continent"]

[Text] Australians are not greatly bothered about the question of the safeguarding of their country's security -- that is what the U.S. magazine U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT reckons. But important events taking place in Australian sociopolitical life indicate that this problem is exercising the minds of a majority of the population of the fifth continent.

Outside the barbed wire fence surrounding the U.S. electronic space reconnaissance military base at Pine Gap, Australian women set up camp and then occupied part of the base itself; the inhabitants of (Big) want their district to be declared a nuclear-free zone: there have been antiwar demonstrations outside the Federal Parliament in Canberra; in a number of Australian cities there have been mass protest demonstrations against U.S. interventionist policy. All these facts are evidence of the growing activeness of Australian peace-loving forces opposed to the concept of security based on a military alliance with the United States -- a concept imposed on their country by Washington.

With the departure of the conservative coalition from the Australian political limelight the White House switched its attention to the Laborites who replaced it. The Reagan administration is working hard on the new Canberra government to make it follow in the wake of the Pentagon's war preparations. To this end Washington strategists are taking advantage of Australia's membership of the ANZUS military bloc. Every since the pact came into being the idea has been peddled in Australia that the country's security can be guaranteed only by close military contact with the United States. But Australians quickly discovered the cost of "security" under Washington's aegis: for the sake of interests alien to Australia they were sent to shed their blood in Korea and later in Vietnam.

In July there was a review of articles of the ANZUS treaty in Washington. But, the Australian magazine BULLETIN wrote, as a result of U.S. pressure the new edition of the treaty is much like the old one. Moreover, despite the fact that the bloc's zone of activity is formally confined to the Pacific Ocean, the White House has enlisted Australia's aid in intensifying the U.S. military presence in the Indian Ocean.

THE WASHINGTON POST has admitted that the United States is allocating to Australia the role of a massive center for electronic space reconnaissance and communications and military transit base. The Pentagon has sited a number of communications centers in Australia to support war preparations in the Pacific and Indian Oceans. U.S. Strategic Air Command B-52 bombers on the Guam-Persian Gulf route land at airfields in Darwin, Perth, and Learmonth. U.S. ships carrying nuclear missiles drop anchor at Fremantle and in Cockburn Sound.

No wonder this "security concept" is making Australians increasingly unhappy. Nor are they deceived by the thesis being assiduously forced on them to the effect that the U.S. military bases give Australia "clout in the international arena." The bases serve to increase the threat of war, they do not serve the cause of peace, the paper THE AGE wrote. Their main and sole task is to prepare "victory" in a nuclear war. Moreover, the presence of the bases automatically makes Australians hostages of the White House's adventurist course. Australian Democratic Party leader Senator D. Chipp addressed Parliament recently, recalling that the base at North West Cape communicates with nuclear submarines.

This alone turns Australia into a target for a relatiatory nuclear strike. The U.S. military's barbarous invasion of Grenada and the deployment of cruise and Pershing-II missiles which has begun in Western Europe only increase the Australians' anxiety.

Recently Australian peace supporters signed a statement backing the Soviet Union's peace initiatives. "We," the document says, "support all Soviet proposals aimed at achieving complete disarmament and eliminating the threat of war." The growth of the antiwar movement on the continent shows that Australians are more acutely aware than ever before of the reality of nuclear catastrophe and are fully determined to struggle against the arms race and against the threat of war.

TALYZIN ATTENDS LPDR ANNIVERSARY MEETING

PM051220 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Fraternal People's Festival"]

[Text] The Lao people, under the leadership of their combat vanguard -- the People's Revolutionary Party -- are confidently creating the foundations of a socialist society. This was emphasized 1 December at a ceremonial meeting of the representatives of Moscow's working people devoted to the eighth anniversary of the proclamation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic [LPDR] and the launch of Soviet-Lao Friendship Week in the USSR.

The keynote speaker -- V.P. Maslin, chairman of the Central Board of the Soviet-Lao Friendship Society -- pointed out that the people pf the friendly state, despite all the difficulties inherited from feudalism and colonialism, have scored considerable successes in developing the national economy.

The head of the Lao-Soviet Friendship Society delegation -- Khamsouk Saignaseng, chairman of the society's presidium and LPDR minister -- declared that relations of fraternal friendship and multifaceted cooperation are developing steadily between the two countries. He voiced cordial gratitude to the USSR for the assistance and support being given his motherland in defending and building a socialist society.

The guest noted the Soviet Union's tremendous contribution to the cause of the struggle for peace and detente. He emphasized that the Lao people fully approve Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's statement.

Participating in the meeting were B. Yazkuliyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; N.V. Talyzin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers: leaders of a number of ministries and departments, representatives of party, soviet, and public organizations, and Khamta Douanthongla, LPDR ambassador to the USSR.

USSR-LAOS ECONOMIC TIES EXAMINED BY JOINT PANEL

PM011501 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In a Businesslike Atmosphere"]

[Text] The fifth session of the USSR-Lao Intergovernmental Commission on Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation was held in Moscow 23 through 30 November.

The Soviet delegation was headed by N.V. Talyzin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the Lao delegation by Nouhak Phoumsavan, first deputy prime minister of Laos. The session discussed questions of further developing economic ties between the two countries, and special attention was devoted to increasing the efficiency of economic cooperation.

The commission examined questions of fulfilling the mutual commitments stemming from the existing Soviet-Lao economic agreements and the decisions of the commission's working groups. It also examined progress in fulfilling both sides' commitments to reciprocal goods shipments in 1983 in accordance with the agreement on commodity exchange and payments between the USSR and Lao Governments for 1980-1985. The session passed in a spirit of mutual understanding and in a businesslike atmosphere.

During its stay in the USSR the delegation visited the Ukrainian SSR, where it familiarized itself with the republic's achievements in the sphere of the economy, culture, and education.

The Lao delegation was received by I.V. Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and had meetings at the USSR Gosplan, the USSR Ministry of Construction, the Ministry of Transport Construction, and the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations.

THAI ENVOY AT MOSCOW THAI NATIONAL DAY SOIREE

PM061020 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Dec Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A soiree for representatives of the public, devoted to the Thai national holiday, was held in Moscow 2 December. Taking part in it was W. Samruatruamphon, Thai ambassador to the USSR.

KAPITONOV MEETS WITH VISITING CPCZ DELEGATION

PM051051 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation's Visit"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for CPSU-CPCZ interparty ties, a CPCZ party delegation headed by M. Beno, secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, was in the Soviet Union 28 November-2 December. It familiarized itself with the CPSU's experience of organizational and political work to implement the decisions of the 26th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums.

The delegation had talks with I.V. Kapitonov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Ye. K. Ligachev, chief of the CPSU Central Committee party organizational work secretary.

The Czechoslovak comrades had talks at the Moscow CPSU Gorkom and the Avtozil Production Association party committee and visited Moscow Oblast's Nara Sovkhoz. The delegation toured the Belorussian SSR, where it had meetings at the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, the Minsk Party Obkom, and the Molodechnenskiy Party Raykom and acquainted itself with the work of the Svetlyy Put Kolkhoz party organizations.

Questions of the further deepening of ties and the mutual exchange of experience of party building were discussed during the meetings, which were held in an atmosphere of fraternal friendship and cordiality.

CSSR Ambassador to the USSR C. Lovetinsky also took part in the talks.

USSR'S PATOLICHEV, CSSR'S URBAN SIGN TRADE PACT

PM051850 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Trade Is Developing"]

[Text] Talks ended successfully in Moscow 1 December between USSR and CSSR Government trade delegations, and a protocol was signed on trade turnover between the two countries for 1984.

The planned volume of trade turnover will be in excess of R12 billion and will increase approximately 12 percent by comparison with 1983.

The CSSR continues to keep a firm hold on one of the leading places in the Soviet Union's foreign trade, while the USSR remains the CSSR's main trading partner.

The Soviet Union will supply the CSSR with metal-working machine tools, electrical and mining equipment, road machinery, oil drilling and hoisting and transport equipment, and other machinery and equipment. Cooperation will continue in the construction of nuclear power stations, the Prague subway, and a number of other important projects in the CSSR. Basic types of fuel and raw material commodities necessary to ensure the planned development of the republic's national economy will be supplied.

It is planned to develop cooperation in the transit of Soviet natural gas through Czechoslovak territory to the West European countries.

The main place in Czechoslovak exports to the USSR, as in previous years, will be taken by various types of machinery and equipment, including those which will help to fulfill the Food Program.

It is also planned to supply equipment for the modernization and reconstruction of light and food industry enterprises and a substantial increase is proposed in reciprocal deliveries of consumer goods. Footwear, sewn and knitted articles, leather goods, textiles, furniture, and other goods will be exported from the CSSR while television sets, radio receivers, sewing machines, clocks and watches, cameras, electric shavers, electric coffee grinders, radio tape recorders, and other items will be exported from the USSR.

The reciprocal deliveries of goods envisaged by the protocol will promote the more successful development of both countries' national economies, the enhancement of their production efficiency, and the fuller satisfaction of the USSR and CSSR populations' needs for consumer goods.

The broad program for reciprocal deliveries of goods attests to the confident advance of economic cooperation and the consolidation of the collaboration and might of the socialist countries under the present complex conditions.

The talks took place in an atmosphere of friendship, comradely mutual understanding, and fruitful cooperation.

The protocol was signed by N.S. Patolichev, USSR minister of foreign trade, and B. Urban, CSSR minister of foreign trade.

The signing was attended by C. Lovetinsky, CSSR ambassador to the USSR.

N.S. Patolichev had talks 1 December with K. Khristov, Bulgarian foreign trade minister; H. Soelle, GDR foreign trade minister; and T. Nestorowicz, Polish foreign trade minister. They discussed questions of the further development of trade and economic relations.

USSR-POLAND TALKS HELD 'INFRATERNAL FRIENDSHIP'

PM051833 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Commission's Session"]

[Text] The routine 26th session of the Soviet-Polish Intergovernmental Commission for Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation has been held in Warsaw. It examined the prospects for economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between the two countries.

Special attention was paid to pooling the sides' efforts to resolve comprehensive intersectorial and sectorial problems, further intensifying industrial development, improving the technical standard and quality of the output produced, exchanging production experience, and establishing direct links between related Soviet and Polish enterprises and organizations in both countries' interests.

Documents of great importance were signed for the further development of Soviet-Polish cooperation: an agreement on scientific and technical cooperation in the field of saving resources in the generation of thermal and electrical energy and sectorial subprograms for the development of production specialization and sharing between the USSR and Poland through 1990 in the field of the automotive and electrical equipment industry and heavy and transport, and chemical and petroleum machine building.

The Soviet delegation was headed by N.V. Talyzin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the Polish delegation by J. Obodowski, deputy chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers. The commission's work took place in an atmosphere of fraternal friendship and total mutual understanding.

HUSAK, KADAR VISITS TO POLAND, GDR DISCUSSED

LD031328 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 2 Dec 83

[Text] The Hungarian leader, Janos Kadar, has paid a visit to the German Democratic Republic, while Czechoslovakia's leader, Gustav Husak, has visited Poland. Our observer Viktor Olenichev comments on the results of the alks in Berlin and Warsaw:

The leaders of socialist countries have regular meetings, as summit talks make it possible to summ up the results of some stage of cooperation between the countries concerned and to outline further cooperation. The socialist countries tackle many economic problems together and with each passing year they expand the sphere of cooperation. The fact had been noted with gratification both in Berlin and in Warsaw. Poland's example shows how important the mutual assistance is, since that country has been subjected to crude pressure by the United States. Aid from allies has helped Poland not only to endure but to enter the road of stabilization. As Wojciech Jaruzelski has said, the Polish people could vividly see again where they have real friends and who are their enemies.

International problems occupied a major place at the talks; understandably, since the world situation has worsened greatly. The leaders of the socialist countries at the talks named the source for the growing tensions -- the aggressive policies of the United States. They declared that the deployment of American nuclear missiles is a serious menace to peace and security both in Europe and in the rest of the world. The final documents issued after the two summits in Berlin and Warsaw also pointed to the responsibility of the West German, British and Italian Governments, as these governments have granted their territory for the new American first-strike weapons targeted primarly against the USSR and its allies. In these conditions the socialist countries have been forced to take countermeasures to promote their security. These measures were outlined in a statement the Soviet leader Yuriy Andropov issued on 24 November. For one thing work will be speeded up to deploy tactical missiles of an extended range on the territory of Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic, Poland and Hungary pledged their full solidarity with the decision of their Warsaw Treaty allies.

It was reemphasized at the same time that these moves are within the limits of what is necessary. They have the aim of maintaining the military strategic equilibrium between East and West, an equilibrium the United States and NATO as a whole are trying to upset. The socialist states have never advocated an arms race. On the contrary, their entire activities on the international scene serve the goal of ridding mankind of the peril of another war. That is confirmed by the numerous proposals from the socialist countries to reduce armaments, including nuclear armaments. The proposals were made earlier in Prague and Moscow. The leaders of Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Poland and Czechoslovakia drew attention to the special urgency in the current situaiton of the proposal to conclude a treaty between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries on the mutual nonuse of armed force and on maintaining the relations of peace. This proposal has been gathering support on a wide scale. The latest example of that was a meeting of the Bureau of the Socialist International in Brussels, which favored such an accord.

There is still the possibility to solve international problems through talks and agreements provided the West displays a realistic approach and goodwill, said President Gustav Husak of Czechoslovakia in Warsaw.

TEXT OF CHNOUPEK INTERVIEW ON MISSILES, USSR TIES

PM051500 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Dec 83 First Edition

[Czechoslovak Foreign Minister B. Chnoupek interviewed by unnamed own correspondent: "Following the Road of Unity" -- date not specified]

[Text] Prague -- Question: The main thrust of the foreign policy course of the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries is to prevent nuclear war. What can you say about the joint efforts of socialist community states to resist the aggressive U.S. plans?

Answer: Through the fault of imperialist circles, and above all the United States, which is seeking to achieve military superiority and to dictate its will to the rest of the world, the international situation has become more complex and has dangerously worsened. This has led to a destabilization of the positive process of detente. The threat of nuclear confrontation has arisen.

In this situation, where attempts to disturb the peoples' tranquil lives are intensifying the need has arisen to proceed with preparatory work for the siting of operational-tactical missile complexes on Czechoslovak and GDR soil. We have been forced to take this essential step because of the West's stance. This being done to prevent the United States and NATO from upsetting the strategic equilibrium and stability in Europe and the world, and from achieving military superiority. Czechoslovakia fully supports the statement Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the measures formulated in it aimed at preventing the upsetting of the existing military-strategic equilibrium in the world. G. Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and Czechoslovak president, has stated this. Those who argue casually about a nuclear first strike "monopoly" must think particularly seriously today about the fact that the missile challenge will not go unanswered.

The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, together with other socialist community countries, aware of their deep responsibility for maintaining world peace, are showing good will and are continuing to seek agreement on the basis of equality and identical security. They have set forth and are continuing to set forth a whole series of new proposals aimed at checking the negative development of the international situation. This is shown by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's pronouncements and by the peace initiatives proclaimed at the January session of the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee. These initiatives were creatively supplemented at the June meeting of leading party and state figures of seven socialist countries in Moscow. The new initiatives contain many important proposals aimed at condeming nuclear war, eliminating nuclear arms, reducing military expenditure, ending the deadly race, implementing military detente in Europe, and resolving other serious international problems.

Question: The United States has declared an ideological "crusade" against socialism with the aim of making the USSR and other socialist countries "change their behavior." How is socialist Czechoslovakia responding to these attempts?

Answer: President Reagan's course is nothing but an attempt to declare war on the law-governed development of history. This course is directly spearheaded against the whole socialist community and simultaneously against individual socialist countries. Washington's so-called differentiated approach to various socialist countries is dictated by its purely tactical maneuvering.

We in Czechoslovakia consider that to fight successfully against such a policy we must unite even more closely and must coordinate and step up all the socialist community's efforts.

The unity of the socialist countries' coordinated approach remains for us the main, determining foundation. Therefore we vigorously promote and support the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries at all international forums, thereby make a concrete contribution to resolving the tasks of the complex present-day international situation. Our country's readiness to participate in the diverse process of the development of international relations and of day-to-day policy and to live in peace and friendship with all the peoples, irrespective of their social system, was emphasized too from the lofty rostrum of the World Assembly "For Peace and Life and Against Nuclear War."

Question: What role did the recent 37th meeting of the CEMA session play in the further deepening of socialist economic integration?

Answer: This CEMA session meeting confirmed that the path of economic integration and the improvement and development of new forms of economic cooperation among the socialist community countries are the best reply to the policy of aggravating international tension, of blackmail, economic embargoes, and various discriminatory measures which the United States and other Western countries employ against the socialist countries on a broad scale.

One of the main items on the session's agenda was the discussion on the intensification of cooperation in the sphere of ensuring the raw-materials, fuel, and energy balance and concern to use them more efficiently and economically. The session adopted a comprehensive program aimed at successfully resolving the CEMA members' raw-material, fuel, and energy problems. The successful development of these sectors may be called a strategic sphere in ensuring the socialist community countries' stable and dynamic development and in increasing their national economic and defense potential.

CEMA did not only discuss major questions within the framework of the further intensification of economic cooperation and the deepening of the processes of national economic integration. Taking account of the political tension in the world, the leaders of the 10 CEMA countries' governments adopted an appeal addressed to the governments of all the countries in the world. It again pointed out the fatal consequences of the course toward aggravating political confrontation, of the feverish fueling of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and of the preparation for the deployment of new nuclear missiles in Europe.

Question: How do you rate the development of bilateral Soviet-CSSR relations?

Answer: All the 40 years that have passed since the signing in December 1943 of the historic treaty on friendship, mutual assistance, and postwar cooperation between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union have convincingly confirmed the crucial place that the alliance with the USSR holds in our foreign policy. Such a position fully meets the Czechslovak people's vital interests.

The highest party and state organs in both countries are paying constant attention to strengthening fraternal relations in all spheres of political, economic, and cultural life. The all-round rapprochement between the CSSR and USSR peoples is taking place in a spirit of socialist internationalism.

Even at the present stage in the formation of a new and unprecedented type of social system it is hard to overestimate the significance of the deep friendship with the Soviet Union. The wealth of Soviet experience help us to find the optimum solutions to the most diverse and often very complex problems of domestic socialist building. Economic, scientific, and technical cooperation with the Soviet Union is vitally necessary for Czechoslovakia.

The long-term program of production sharing and specialization between the CSSR and the USSR for the period up to 1990 which creates a stable basis for long-term commodity exchange is being successfully implemented.

The experience of our Soviet friends is for us at the same time a reliable guideline in determining our foreign policy course. It is the alliance with the USSR and membership of the great family of socialist states that guarantee our people's social and economic stability and security and strengthen Czechoslovakia's prestige in the international arena.

PONOMAREV, ZIMYANIN RECEIVE DKP DELEGATION

LD052129 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] A meeting took place at the CPSU Central Committee between Comrades Ponomarev, Zimyanin and Zagladin, and a delegation from the German Communist Party (DKP) comprising comrades Mies, Gautier and Schroeder. They exchanged information on the activities of their parties and discussed a number of urgent political issues. Profound anxiety was expressed at the sharp worsening of the international situation, a new example of which is the beginning of the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in the FRG and a number of other West European countries. Participants in the meeting noted that in the present situation, it is becoming more and more imperative to stir into activity all people of good will and the popular masses who oppose the arms race and the deployment of U.S. missiles, in defense of peace and to ensure the security of present and future generations. Communist and workers' parties bear special responsibility for this. They are powerful factors in the struggle against the aggressive policies of imperialism.

FRENCH TIES TO NATO SEEN AT 'NEW LEVEL'

LD042005 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Dec 83 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Rapprochement With NATO"]

[Text] New York, 1 Dec -- France's decision to create a "rapid action force" for use in Europe has led to a discussion within NATO on the question of practical steps to include France's military measures in NATO-elaborated plans, THE NEW YORK TIMES writes. The French Defense Ministry has admitted, the paper points out, that talks are already under way with the NATO allies regarding the possibility of joint action with them, in particular on FRG territory.

THE NEW YORK TIMES stresses that these "talks bearing on the role of intervention forces confirm France's increased commitments to its allies in the area of joint action on West German territory in the event of a crisis situation."

"The creation of the 'rapid action force', which will comprise 47,000 men, is stipulated by the French military program for 1984-1988," the newspaper writes. The intention is that the force will include "five divisions, including an air-mobile division with 90 antitank helicopters, 30 fire support helicopters, and 90 transport helicopters, as well as an airborne assault division, a division of marines, a motorized division, and a mountain riflemen division."

The creation of these forces, THE NEW YORK TIMES points out, raises French cooperation with the NATO allies to a new level.

SOVIET-FINNISH LEGAL COMMISSION MEETS IN MOSCOW

PM050903 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Commission Session"]

[Text] A session of the Soviet-Finnish joint commission set up in accordance with the agreement between the governments of the USSR and Finland on cooperation in legal matters took place 29-30 November in Moscow under the chairmanship of USSR Minister of Justice V.I. Terebilov.

The results of cooperation in 1983 were examined. It was noted that, on the firm basis of the 1948 Soviet-Finnish Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance, Soviet and Finnish jurists are making a real contribution to consolidating the legal regulation of economic and other ties between the two states.

The commission approved a work plan for the coming period.

The Finnish delegation at the session was headed by Finland's minister of justice, C. Taxell.

FINNISH-SOVIET CONGRESS ACTIVITIES REPORTED

2 Dec Opening

LD022044 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 2 Dec 83

[Text] Helsinki December 2 TASS -- The 13th congress of the Finland-Soviet Union Society, one of the biggest public organizations of the country, opened here today. It is attended by about 700 delegates and also guests from the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, GDR, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Norway, France, Denmark and Sweden.

A message from president of Finland Mauno Koivisto was read out to the participants in the congress. In the message it is emphasized that in conditions of the present-day complicated international situation friendship, and goodneighbourliness between the Soviet Union and Finland acquire ever greater significance for the strengthening of security of the peoples of both countries, and the peoples of the whole of Europe.

Missile Deployment Decried

LD040136 Moscow TASS in English 2101 GMT 3 Dec 83

[Text] Helsinki December 3 TASS -- TASS correspondent V. Dodonov reports:

The 13th congress of the Finland-Soviet Union Friendship Society continues its work here in an atmosphere of lively activity and businesslike approach to questions under consideration. Delegates concentrate on the outstanding problems of efforts for peace, international detente and disarmament, and also on ways of the comprehensive development of Soviet-Finnish relations.

Addressing the congress with a message of greetings from the Finnish Government, Finance Minister A. Pekkala noted that the activities of society were enjoying the great respect of the government and other authorities of the Republic. He said that the society was making a tangible contribution to the development of Finland's relations with the Soviet Union, which were central to its international contacts.

The society's general secretary, Erkki Kivimaki, said in his address that at present friendship and cooperation pervade every area of relations between the two countries and enjoy broad public support in Finland. The society, he continued, is an organisation seeking to strengthen peace. It is particularly important to stress it today, when international relations are going through a critical period. The deployment of new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe is greatly enhancing the threat of nuclear war, Erkki Kivimaki said. In this situation it is the important task of the society graphically to demonstrate on the example of good Soviet-Finnish relations the possibility of peaceful cooperation among nations despite differnces between their social systems.

Tapio Waris, director of the Finnish Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies Institute, spoke highly of the Soviet peace initiatives and noted that the positions of the Soviet Union and Finland on matters of strengthening peace and removing the threat of nuclear war were rather close.

FRENCH DEFENSE MINISTER'S SPEECH AT WEU CITED

LD021323 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2000 GMT 1 Dec 83

[Text] Paris, 1 Dec (TASS) -- The 29 th session of the Assembly of the West European Union (WEU) -- which is closely connected with the United States and NATO, the military-political grouping of the seven countries of Western Europe -- concluded its work here today.

The recommendations adopted by the participant countries are the latest testimony to the WEU's obedient following in the wake of the adventuristic policy of the present American Administration. In particular this is confirmed by the resolutions adopted on the lifting of limitations on developing the FRG Armed Forces and on the use of military contingents from WEU participant-countries "beyond the limits of the NATO zone of responsibility."

At the session, the speech by French Minister of National Defense Charles Hernu, who spoke out for a further buildup in the combat power of the armed forces of West European countries, was given a militaristic spirit. The minister also said that "security in Europe cannot be ensured without guarantees from the United States and without the presence of American troops in Europe."

Touching on plans to create French "rapid action forces," Charles Hernu admitted that they are intended first and foremost for waging joint actions with union allies on the territory of Europe. He noted that the presence of these forces "gives the government of the country new opportunities for actions on the side of union members." Apart from that, added the minister, the "rapid action forces" can also be used for ensuring the security of states tied to France through bilateral agreements on military cooperation.

BRIEFS

COOPERATION PROGRAM WITH NETHERLANDS -- A program for cultural and scientific cooperation between the USSR and the Netherlands during 1984-86 has been signed at the Soviet Embassy in The Hague. The program provides for the expansion of ties in the field of music and fine arts and contacts in the sphere of education, medicine and other areas of science and culture. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 3 Dec 83 LD]

TASS STATEMENT ON U.S. AIR ATTACK IN LEBANON

PM061113 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Dec 1983 Second Edition p 3

["TASS Statement"]

[Text] The United States, carrying on the escalation of its armed intervention in the Middle East, has perpetrated another barbarous act of aggression in Lebanon.

Several dozen fighter-bombers based on aircraft carriers of the U.S. Navy subjected a number of areas to massive bombing in the Lebanese mountains, including the positions of the Lebanese national-patriotic forces and the Syrian troops participating in the pan-Arab peace-keeping force in that country. That unprovoked raid of the U.S. Air Force was perpetrated obviously to aggravate deliberately the situation in Lebanon and around it and to create a pretext for the further escalation of the U.S. acts of aggression against Syria.

One cannot fail to see a direct relationship between the latest piratic attack and the far-reaching anti-Arab "strategic conspiracy" between Washington and Tel Aviv, formalized during the recent talks between President Reagan and the Israeli leaders. In fact, the raid of the U.S. Air Force was a part of the joint operation carried out by the United States and Israel to impose on the Lebanese a settlement which is at odds with their vital interests. It is the United States and Israel that thwarted, by their actions, the cease-fire agreement in Lebanon that had been observed hitherto and it is they and their governments that bear all responsibility for the consequences.

The U.S. aggressive action provides yet another clear confirmation that Washington and Tel Aviv are not interested in maintaining peace and tranquility in the Middle East, and that they would wish to subject the whole of that region to their military and political control. The present U.S. Administration has irrevocably doffed the mask of an "honest broker" in the Middle Eastern affairs, and has openly opted for the course of military-power pressure against those resisting Israel's expansionism and the U.S. diktat.

This new act of aggression by the USA constitutes an act of defiance vis-a-vis the United Nations organization, and a gross violation of the decisions of the U.N. Security Council aimed at restoring Lebanon's sovereignty and safeguarding its independence and territorial integrity.

In resolutely condemning this aggressive action, the Soviet Union declares its solidarity with the peoples of Lebanon, Syria, and other Arab countries in defending their independence and resisting the U.S.-Israeli attempts to foist shackling conditions of a Middle East settlement on them by force.

The U.S. Government ought to be aware that U.S. armed interference in Lebanon, the aggressive actions of the United States against Syria constitute a serious threat to peace not only in the Middle East region.

KHADDAM WRITES SECURITY COUNCIL ON U.S. 'RAID'

LD051952 Moscow TASS in English 1935 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] New York December 5 TASS -- A raid of U.S. planes on the positions of the Syrian contingent of inter-Arab peace-keeping forces in Lebanon is a new step toward the escalation of hostilities. This piratic action exposes the aggressive aims of the United States policy in Lebanon and in the Middle East.

This is noted in a letter of Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Syria 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam to chairman of the United Nations Security Council. A letter points out the fact that the U.S. raid has become a new manifestation of a dangerous collusion between the United States and Israel and a direct consequence of the recent visit of the Israeli prime minister to Washington. 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam points out that the military actions of the United States and Israel represent a serious threat to international peace and security.

SYRIAN UN DELEGATE HITS U.S.-ISRAELI AGREEMENT

LD051927 Moscow TASS in English 1815 GMT 5 Dec

[Text] New York, December 5 (TASS) -- The permanent representative of Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations, Diya' Allah al-Fattah, has pointed out the presence of the U.S. Marines and the fleet in Lebanon was an "attempt to subjugate the region to American provocation and blackmail and to protect the Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon, Palestine and the Golan Heights."

Addressing the 38th session of the UN General Assembly on the question of Palestine he said the United States chose the "alternative of threatening war" when the Marines landed and when it participated in warring against the Lebanese. The U.S. mobilized the greatest flotilla following the Second World War offshore Lebanon. There were 40 warships, three aircraft carriers and 300 modern aircraft.

Diya' Allah al-Fattah characterized a new U.S.-Israeli agreement concluded as a result of recent negotiations between the prime-minister of Israel Shamir and representatives of the American Administration as designed for "total co-ordination in the matter of aggression against the Arab people" and, primarily, against Syria which was an "unpenetrable force" standing in the way of attempts to impose American hegemony in the region."

The American Administration, he went on, was keen to obtain Israeli assistance and support to promote its presence in occupied Lebanon and to perpetrate joint aggression against the Syrian Arab Republic and the people and territory of Lebanon, he went on. These aggressive movements were not new. Cooperation between the forces of evil was ever present, and the recent co-operation agreements between the Reagan administration and the racist regime of Tel Aviv was merely a "recompense to Israel for the crimes and aggression" it had perpetuated and will continue to perpetuate.

There is no doubt that this co-operation was based principally on the eradication of the Palestinian cause. This was a price paid for the services by Israel to America, the representative of Syrian Arab Republic concluded.

SHULTZ CONFIRMS U.S. 'RIGHT' TO 'PIRATIC RAIDS'

LD060729 Moscow TASS in English 0717 GMT 6 Dec 83

[Text] Washington December 6 TASS -- The USA continues to follow the path of escalating armed interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon and of expanding aggressive actions against Syria and other sovereign countries of the region. This has been confirmed by a statement made by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz at a press-conference in Washington. He made it clear that the Reagan administration reserves a "right" to resort, in the future as well, to piratic raids on Lebanon's areas where the Syrian contingent for keeping peace in that country is located. Shultz confirmed that U.S. troops would remain in Lebanon for an indefinitely long time, i.e. as long as is necessary for Washington to attain its military and strategic goals in the Middle East.

REAGAN TRIES TO JUSTIFY 'BARBAROUS' BOMBINGS

LD051903 Moscow TASS in English 1512 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] Washington December 5 TASS -- President Reagan and other American leaders have hastened to make statements trying to justify their aggressive actions in Lebanon by invoking the so-called "self-defence". At the same time, however, Reagan has threatened to take new military action in that country, stating in so many words that U.S. troops will open fire again should similar circumstances develop.

Even the American press admits that the barbarous bombardment by U.S. aircraft of the position of the Syrian contingent of the inter-Arab peace force in Lebanon is not some "retaliatory measure", but is rather the commencement of the implementation of the U.S.-Israeli agreements on broadening their "strategic cooperation". The CBS television company has described the action as a sinister day of escalation of the armed interference in Lebanon.

THE NEW YORK TIMES says that the Reagan administration's decision to bomb the Syrian positions in Lebanon was designed to serve as a warning to Syria that it faces the threat of an increasing military pressure from the USA and Israel.

THE NEW YORK TIMES says that according to some officials the motives that prompted this step lie much deeper and were at the center of the discussions held by President Reagan and other ranking administration officials with the Israeli leaders in Washington last week on the need for more muscle-flexing to intimidate Syria.

The newspaper says (?that during these discussions) the USA presented the political conclusions formulated by Reagan's advisers over a month ago. Those conclusions were incorporated in a document known as a secret directive of the National Security Council, signed by Reagan on October 29.

Local observers point to a direct link between the aerial attack on the Syrian positions and the recent talks in the U.S. capital between Israeli Prime Minister Shamir and President Reagan. During those talks the ABC T.V. Network says, a new U.S.-Israeli agreement was concluded, which provides for a broadening of the aggression in Lebanon. This was, to all intents and purposes, also recognized by Israel's Prime Minister Shamir. Appearing on an ABC programme, he stressed the "commonality of the objectives" pursued in Lebanon by the United States and Israel, and expressed his "complete understanding of the motives" behind the raid.

SPEAKES SAYS FLIGHTS OVER LEBANON TO CONTINUE

LD052053 Moscow TASS in English 2037 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] Washington December 5 TASS -- The United States continues heightening tension in Lebanon. White House Deputy Press Secretary Larry Speakes told the newsmen that U.S. war planes resumed flights over Lebanese territory today. He said these flights will be continued.

As is known, following such provocative flights, U.S. planes bombed past Saturday the positions of the Syrian contingent of the inter-Arab peace-keeping forces in Lebanon. Speakes made a brazen attempt to justify this piratic action as a measure of precaution taken for purposes of self-defence.

U.S. 'BANDIT ATTACKS' CAUSE 'DELIBERATE' STRAIN

LD060626 Moscow World Service in English 2300 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] On Sunday the United States launched heavy bombing raids against the positions held by the Syrian peace-keeping contingents in Lebanon. Three American planes were hit by ground fire. Of them an A-7 Corsair and an EA-6 Intruder did not make it back to the aircraft carriers, "Independence" and "John F. Kennedy." Another eight Marines were killed and two wounded in heavy artillery duels. The lost planes were the first to have been downed after the war in Vietnam.

The American bombing on Sunday was seen as a grave sign that President Reagan was determined to draw the American troops into a direct military confrontation with Syria. The Italian defense minister, Giovanni Spadolini, has said in this respect that his government was worried by the U.S. bombing and hinted that Italy might have to reconsider its commitment to the Multinational Force in Lebanon.

In the meantime President Reagan was reported as saying that attacks against the Syrian contingents would continue. Pentagon and administration officials claimed that the bombing raid by some 30 American planes armed with [word indistinct] and cluster bombs was in retaliation for unwarranted anti-aircraft fire against U.S. reconnaissance aircraft. However, reports from Beirut indicate that the bombing raid was launched as part of a secret U.S.-Israeli agreement on military cooperation and that its purpose went far beyond a reprisal.

First of all, late last week a high-ranking administration official revealed that the American President was contemplating a preemptive strike against Syrian forces. Secondly, the Israeli Air Force had been notified about the coming raid. Obviously there must have been consultations with Israel prior to the raid. In these circumstances, aerial reconnaissance is not an act of self-defense, as the President claims, but the probing of Syrian air defenses and a target selection mission.

Five Democratic presidential candidates warned on Sunday against an escalation of the conflict in Lebanon. One of them, Jesse Jackson, called the raid a kind of declaration of war and former Senator George McGovern said that step by step the United States is approaching war with Syria.

As was the case in the past President Reagan decided in favor of propaganda instead of the truth in presenting his position. He and his aides keep saying that the U.S. forces are after missile sites and is not prepared to go to war with Syria in Lebanon.

But missiles are part of air defenses in any armed forces, the United States and Israel no exception. Therefore, going after missile sites without going to war is ridiculous. Such claims could be made by those who have no faith in the mental abilities of their own people. Serious analysts draw a parallel between an Israeli raid against Syria and Palestinian positions on Saturday and the American bombing on Sunday. They point out that these actions are the first expression of the spirit of understanding reached between the United States and Israel last week. The U.S.-Israeli agreement calls for strategic cooperation and such concrete steps as joint exercises, exchange of military information and experience, more sales of American hardware to Israel and other steps. In fact, it appears that the Reagan administration counts on Israel in fighting Syria.

Even in Israel many people were reported worried about being drawn into a bigger war. UPI quotes Bruno Savaldi, an Israeli journalist, as saying: What a mess. One pilot dead, another captured and the third comes back wet. What does the United States need a war with Syria for?

The reaction in Lebanon was much stronger. Former Prime Minister Salim al-Huss said he was appalled by the attack and denounced the Americans. We are surprised and despise the fact, he said, that America has drawn itself into a position tantamount to sinking in the Lebanese quicksand and drawing with it the Lebanese people into more woes and misery. And Prime Minister Shafiq al-Wazzan said that the raid was an escalating cycle resulting with [as heard] the Israeli occupation.

In the meantime the Soviet news agency TASS says in a statement that the United States carried out the mass air raid on a number of regions in the Lebanon mountains to deliberately strain the situation in Lebanon and around it, and to create a pretext for further expanding U.S. aggressive actions against Syria. The document says that this bandit attack is linked with the so-called strategic conspiracy between Washington and Tel Aviv, directed against the Arabs. The TASS statement notes that the unprovoked American actions are a challenge to the United Nations and a gross violation of the Security Council decision aimed at restoring Lebanon's sovereignty. The Soviet Union identified itself with the people of Lebanon, Syria and other Arab countries standing up to the attempts of the United States and Israel to impose on them by force shackling conditions for a Middle East settlement.

U.S.-ISRAELI MILITARY 'COLLUSION' EXAMINED

LD042132 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1500 GMT 4 Dec 83

[Text] The U.S.-Israeli agreements reached during the visit of Israeli Prime Minister Shamir to Washington have caused preoccupation and deep concern in the Arab countries. Everywhere, these agreements are considered a new phase in the anti-Arab collusion. Here follows, gentlemen, a commentary by our military commentator, Colonel Teodor Nikolayev, touching upon the military aspect of this collusion:

Reagan and Shamir have agreed on the setting up of a so-called U.S.-Israel tical committee. It has been officially announced that this committee will be concerned with the following issues: planning for the preparation and undertaking of joint military training and maneuvers, siting military hardware and ammunition in Israeli territory, and equipping Israeli ports to harbor the American 6th Fleet, which is continuously in the Mediterranean. All this is only one important part of the military-political alliance between the United States and Israel, and this is just one aspect of the ill-conceived anti-Arab alliance. The other aspect is the U.S. agreement to further strengthen the aggressive power of Tel Aviv. The United States has pledged a considerable increase in the volume of military and economic assistance to Israel, mostly in the form of grants. The United States will also give financial aid to Israel for projects involving the manufacture of new types of offensive weapons, including fighter planes.

Reports also say that the United States will supply Israel with 4,000 of the cluster bombs already tested against the peaceful populations of Palestine and Lebanon in the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. Moreover, having the American naval force use the port of Haifa and other Israeli ports as U.S. naval bases will constitute a permanent danger to all the Arabs. I would like to point out to the listeners that U.S. ships which will use Israeli ports as bases are carrying nuclear weapons and cruise missiles capable of carrying these weapons to targets.

Thus, all the Arab countries find themselves under the threat of a nuclear strike in the event of an armed conflict with Israel. One can be sure that the United States will take advantage of the occasion at least to blackmail these Arab countries. I would like to also draw the attention of the listeners to another aspect: Recently THE NEW YORK TIMES carried an article saying that President Reagan had signed a top-secret directive to the U.S. National Security Council. According to this directive, the United States intends not only to entrench itself in Lebanon but to extend the military bases existing in the Middle East. It will also strengthen its fleets in the Mediterranean and the Gulf, thus surrounding the Arab countries with a pair of pincers. The directive is also significant in that it provides for the preparation of the Israeli hospitals to receive American military men. This is proof of the joint military acts planned by the United States and Israel against the Arabs.

So one can safely say that the American-Israeli ill-conceived alliance is directed against the national interests of all Arab countries without exception. It will further complicate the Middle East tangle, and will lead to an aggravation of military tension in the Middle East.

REAGAN 'HATCHING PLANS' FOR ATTACK ON SYRIA

LD051636 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] Tripoli December 5 TASS -- The bandit raids of U.S. planes against the positions of the Syrian contingent included in the inter-Arab peace-keeping force in Lebanon, as well as the barbarous shelling of Lebanese cities and villages, are evidence of a dangerous escalation of U.S. military involvement in Lebanon, the JANA news agency of Libya points out. The actions of the U.S. military coordinated with Tel Aviv flagrantly violate the norms of international law. Their aim is to subordinate Lebanon to U.S. diktat and to use its territory for an aggression against neighbouring Arab countries.

The Reagan administration is hatching plans of an armed attack on Syria, which resolutely rejects the U.S. policy of pressure and terror. Libya urges peoples of Arab countries to jointly repulse Washington's aggressive designs, JANA stresses.

U.S. 'BRAZEN' BEHAVIOR IMPEDES LEBANON AGREEMENT

LD031433 Moscow TASS in English 1343 GMT 3 Dec 83

[Text] Washington December 3 TASS -- The Reagan administration intends to search only for such "settlement" of the Lebanese problem which would meet the aggressive expansionist designs of the United States and its "strategic ally" in the Middle East, Israel. This has been made clear by Washington leaders to President Amin al-Jumayyil of Lebanon who completed his official visit to the United States. He met President Ronald Reagan, Secretary of State George Shultz, Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger and other highly-placed officials in the administration.

According to Secretary of State Shultz, expressed during the talks was the urgent need for reaching progess in settling Lebanon's problems. AP agency points out, however, that Shultz's and Al-Jumayyil's statements contained nothing that would indicate an early withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon. Meanwhile, it is the brazen behavior of the Israeli and American military in that much-suffering Arab country that is the chief obstacle in the way of a just settlement of its problems.

'Deliberately Blocks' Solution

LD021009 Moscow TASS in English 0759 GMT 2 Dec 83

[Text] Washington December 2 TASS -- The U.S. Administration deliberately blocks up the quest for the early and fair settlement in Lebanon. That was reaffirmed by the very first round of negotiations which are being conducted by President of Lebanon, Amin al-Jumayyil, who came here for a visit. He met with President Reagan and Secretary of State Shultz.

Judging by pronouncements of high-placed figures of the administration, Washington refuses to discuss with the Lebanese president any versions of settlement but those that would consider the interests of the United States itself and its "strategic ally" in the region -- Israel. Thus, President Reagan having proclaimed the readiness of the United States to do the utmost to give support for the efforts aimed at restoration of independence of Lebanon, made it absolutely clear that no alternative to the so-called Lebanese-Israeli agreement would be acceptable to Washington.

Actual partitioning of Lebanon, consolidation of the consequences of the last year's Israeli aggression are known to have been the result of that agreement which was imposed upon the Lebanese Government by the Reagan administration and Tel Aviv.

U.S. MIDEAST POLICY DURING ELECTION YEAR VIEWED

LD031642 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1315 GMT 3 Dec 83

[From the "International Review" program presented by Vladimir Dunayev]

[Text] The Middle East. The strategic alliance revived this week in Washington between Reagan and Shamir heralds nothing good for this already explosive part of the world. They say that in an election year every U.S. President does everything within his power to demonstrate his friendship with Israel, and that, of course, is just what does happen.

But this time it is not a matter of loans or gifts of billions of dollars, but of unleashing the Israeli invasion army which has been armed by the United States. This army does not fight in the state of Israel, nor even on its borders, but has long been fighting now on foreign soil, specializing in raiding and occupying Arab lands. Having burnt its fingers in Lebanon, the Reagan administration, by means of a direct military alliance with Israel, wants to kill two birds with one stone: to reduce the casualties among the Marines, which is a necessity just before the elections, and to throw in the Israeli commandos to avenge the explosion in Beirut in order to whip up chauvinistic passions on the eve of the presidential elections.

Washington is evidently hoping somehow to involve in its plans the Lebanese president, who is now in the U.S. capital. However Lebanese interests, of course, in no way coincide with those of Reagan and Shamir: rather they are the opposite.

MOSCOW MEETING EXPRESSES SUPPORT FOR PLO

PM050935 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Nov 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Immutable Solidarity"]

[Text] The participants in a meeting of Moscow's public expressed fervent support for the just struggle of the Arab people of Palestine against Israeli aggression and to achieve independence, secure their inalienable right to self-determination, and create their own national state.

The meeting was held 28 November to mark the International Day of Solidarity with the Arab People of Palestine.

The keynote speaker -- Yu.YA. Barabash, chairman of the Soviet Committee for Friendship and Solidarity with the Arab People of Palestine and USSR first deptuy minister, said that Israel's policy vis-a-vis the Palestinians is aimed at destroying not only the verbal concept of the "Arab people of Palestine," but also the nation as such. The unceremonious and brutal acts of the aggressors would hardly be possible, he pointed out, if they were not supported by the U.S. patrons, who provide them with economic, military, and political assistance.

It was stressed that the cohesion of the Arab Palestinian people and cooperation among all Arab anti-imperialist forces are necessary conditions for the success of their just cause. The PLO -- the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian people -- must continue to play an important role here.

R.M. ash-Sha'ir, PLO charge d'affaires ad interim in the USSR, voiced profound gratitude to the Soviet Union for its principled position vis-a-vis the PLO's problems and its immutable support for the Palestinians' struggle for their national interests.

Taking part in the meeting were the heads of the diplomatic missions of a number of Arab states accredited in the USSR.

USSR, EGYPT SIGN PROTOCOL TO INCREASE TRADE

PM051838 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 83 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Peresada dispatch: "In Mutual Interests"]

[Text] Cairo, 2 Dec -- The signing of a protocol on trade turnover between the USSR and the Arab Republic of Egypt for 1984 has taken place here. In accordance with the protocol, the volume of bilateral trade will increase by almost one-third compared with this year.

"One more important step has been taken to strengthen trade ties with the Soviet Union," (Kh.) Ahmad Husayn, Egyptian first deputy minister of economy and trade, told PRAVDA's correspondent. "It is characteristic that these ties are invariably built on the principles of mutual understanding and common advantage. The expansion of trade will undoubtedly serve to develop relations between our countries."

USSR'S OGARKOV ON 'FRIENDLY VISIT' TO ALGERIA

LD061338 Moscow TASS in English 1320 GMT 6 Dec 83

[Text] Algiers December 6 TASS -- Marshal of the Soviet Union Nikolay Ogarkov, chief of the General Staff of the Armed forces of the USSR, first deputy defence minister of the USSR, arrived in the Algerian capital today for an official friendly visit.

At the Algerian airport the delegation was met by Colonel Moustafa Bellousif, [TASS spelling] secretary general of the National Defence Ministry of Algeria, commanders of armed services of Algeria, representatives of the arms of the service as well as the USSR amoassador to Algeria, Vasiliy Taratuta.

RETIRING RSFSR TRANSPORT MINISTER REPLACED

PM051356 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "In the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade Yuriy Sergeyevich Sukhin RSFSR minister of motor transport, relieving Comrade Yevgeniy Georgiyevich Trubitsyn from this position in connection with his retirement on pension.

ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OFFICIAL DECORATED

PM051105 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 2

[Decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on the Award of the Order of the Friendship of the Peoples to Comrade A.N. Yakovlev, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economy and International Relations" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] Comrade Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economy and International Relations, is awarded the Order of the Friendship of the Peoples for services in the development of historical science and the training of scientific cadres and in connection with his 60th birthday.

Yu. Andropov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

T. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

Moscow, the Kremlin, 1 December 1983

TURKMEN CENTRAL COMMITTEE PRESIDIUM MEETS

GF051550 Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian 19 Nov 83 p 2

[Excerpts] A regular meeting of the [Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet] Presidium was held under the chairmanship of M.G. Shmidt, member of the Turkmenistan Communist Party Central Committee bureau and deputy chairman of the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

At the proposal of the Agriculture and Protection of Nature Commission and the Education and Science Commission of the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet, the meeting discussed a question on the work of the scientific research institutes of the Turkmen SSR Agriculture Ministry in implementing the Food Program in light of the decisions of the May and November 1982 and June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenums. Some other questions were also discussed. Corresponding resolutions were passed on all questions discussed.

O. Ovezgeldiyev, chairman of the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet; N.T. Suyunov, deputy chairman of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers; A. Begdzhanov, chairman of Ashkhabad city soviet executive committee; and others participated in the discussion.

SUPREME SOVIET COMMISSION DISCUSSES ENERGY

PM021257 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 2

[Yu. Grinko report "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Chambers' Standing Commissions": Augmentation Through Thrift"]

[Text] Electricity is a very important lever of the scientific and technical revolution. Therefore, one of our economy's urgent tasks is to ensure a high comparative rate of electricity generation.

In th r preliminary consideration, on instructions from the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium of the draft state plan for the economic and social development of the USSR in 1984, the draft USSR State Budget for 1984 and the progress made in the fulfillment of the 1983 plan, the members of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers' Standing Commissions paid special attention to energy industry problems. They were covered by meetings of the preparatory commissions, including those on energy. We will be discussing one of them today.

The session was conducted by Commission Chairman G.P. Bogomyakov, first secretary of Tyumen CPSU Obkom. During the discussion reports were delivered by P.P. Falaleyev, USSR first deputy minister of power and electrification; A.A. Troitskiy, deputy chief of the USSR Gosplan Power and Electrification Department; Yu. A. Folin, deputy chief of the State Committee for Science and Technology Power and Electrical Equipment Department; and I.A. Bludov, deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Finance Heavy Industry Financing Administration.

It was noted that USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification Industry enterprises, in implementing the Energy Program, elaborated under the leadership of the CPSU Central Committee, have ensured a steadier power supply this year for the country's national economic sectors and for the population. Power generation is expected to be 42.9 billion kw-hours up on 1982. At the sector's power stations executive discipline has improved, as have fuel supplies.

But, as the session rightly pointed out, a number of parts of the country have seen restrictions on consumer supplies in the fall-winter period -- the Urals, West Siberia, Kazakhstan, the Far East and even some parts of the Ukraine. Half the time the purity [chistota] of the current has not been up to scratch. The Ministry of Power and Electrification has also failed to solve the chief task of sector development -- fulfilling the plan for commissioning new energy capacities. Construction of nuclear power stations is falling short of the 5-year plan. Power supply network construction work is unsatisfactory and there has been no improvement in the state of affairs regarding the construction of rural electrification facilities.

It was pointed out that substantial resources were unutilized in the first 2 years of the 5-year plan. In the January-August 1983 period alone construction and installation work lagged behind the plan to the tune of R136 million. The power workers' omissions are obvious, but a considerable measure of responsibility also rests, of course, with the power machine building sectors and other departments and state supply organs that have failed to ensure prompt supplies of material resources and equipment.

The deputies stressed that the lag in the commissioning of energy capacities is absolutely intolerable since the quantity of worn-out equipment in the sector is increasing and is already quite large proportionately. In these conditions it is necessary to elaborate and implement major retooling and modernization measures as well as ensuring that all the funds allocated for capital construction are used.

Deputy Sh. R. Abdurashitov drew attention to the exploitation of unutilized capacities at thermal power stations as a major reserve. For example, in the Bashkir power system, he said, by erecting 10 cooling towers costing around R12 million, you can obtain an extra capacity of 0.5 million kw which is 10 times cheaper than commissioning the same capacity at a new power station. On a national scale, the exploitation of a mere one half of the unused capacities would mean a massive economic gain.

There was an earnest discussion at the Standing Commission meeting in connection with the need to make fuller use of reserves for the economical utilization of fuel and energy resources. After all, a saving of 1 kw-hour of electricity is not only a saving of several kopeks but also of the labor of the workers who extract the fuel and those who work at power stations and it also means the efficient utilization of equipment associated with electricity generation. At the same time, every kilowatt-hour saved means the possibility of extra products. It will produce an extra 40 kg of coal, 33 kg of oil, 15 kg of iron ore, 5 kg of steel and 120 kg of bread.

A check has shown that many ministries have overconsumed power to the tune of around 2 billion kw-hours instead of saving it. The targets on saving fuel and energy resources are not being met by the Ministry of Power and Electrification either -- in the 10-month period overconsumption was 1,338,000 metric tons of standard fuel. Therefore, the task is to stop extravagance wherever it occurs. Work on reducing power losses in power-supply systems, eliminating outages and limiting the capacity of power stations and increasing their flexibility [manevrennost] is being conducted too slowly. The conversion of power stations to gas must be speeded up. Before the end of the year 10 power stations will be working on gas, which means that next year it will be possible to reduce fuel oil consumption by 6 million metric tons. Work must be stepped up on the fulfillment of state scientific and technical programs envisaging the creation of special flexible equipment: steam and gas installations and large-capacity gas turbines.

That the proportion of fuel expended on producing each kw-hour can be excessive is largely a consequence of the low quality of coal for power generation. This problem is not new. In the coal industry there are still many coal faces where the amount of rock hewn [with the coal] is too great owing to a shortage of specialized equipment and violations of extraction techniques, especially in thin seams; enriching factories' capacity cannot always cope with the required workload involved in bringing the extracted coal up to the necessary condition. Bearing in mind the fact that the quality characteristics of solid fuel, judging by forecasts, will continue to deteriorate, we need to modernize boiler units more promptly so that they will be able to "cope with" high-ash coal. Expecially as we do have experience of doing this -- at the Kurakhovskiy GRES, for instance. The fact that repair of power installations is often delayed and that repairs have to be repeated because of the low quality of the work must not be tolerated. New projects are sometimes too long in being brought up to design capacity.

The commission recommended that the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification guarantee a reliable power supply for the national economy on the basis of increasing the stability of the functioning of the country's unified power system. Attention was drawn to the need to implement measures to reduce losses of electric power during transmission in electricity grids, and renovate obsolete and uneconomic equipment and installations currently being used. The level of use and the repair quality of power equipment and grids, and of power station capacities must be increased. The task has been set of increasing the pace of construction and installation work, and accelerating the commissioning of power projects, especially at nuclear power stations and at stations using cheap coal from the Ekibastuz and Kansk-Achinsk coalfields as well as local gas in the regions of the West Siberian Oil and Gas Complex.

The draft plan for 1984 envisages a 3.9-percent growth in electric power production, the scheduled consumption rates in agriculture being 1.5 times higher than in the national economy as a whole. It has to be said that next year a cut in uncomissioned capacities of the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification to 75 million kw as against 82.6 million kw in 1983 is planned.

What is going on here? The situation today is as follows: A definite dissipation of capital investment on a large number of construction projects has begun to appear in the sector. Yet in terms of technical readiness the uncommissioned reserve is half of the normative. The plan therefore envisages this approach: Channel resources as far as possible toward bringing the uncommissioned equipment reserve up to the normative without wasting money on new construction projects. The need has arisen to relieve the Ministry of Power and Electrification of the burden of construction work unrelated to power generation also, which at present is running at an unjustifiably large volume in the sector.

After examining the indicators in the drafts of the 1984 State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR and of the 1984 USSR State Budget in the section "Fuel and Energy Industry and Geology" the preparatory commission has elaborated proposals and comments which will be an integral part of the findings of the planning, budget, and other [commissions of the] chambers.

RAILWAYS MINISTER 'EMBARRASSED' OVER SERVICE

LD022336 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 2 Dec 83

[Remarks by USSR Railways Minister Nikolay Konarev to journalists at press conference at Ministry of Railways on 2 December--- recorded]

[Text] Little more than a year has passed since the November Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. As is known, at it, railway transportation was subjected to harsh criticism for serious shortcomings in its work. In this connection we would like to inform you today of how we are fulfilling the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee November Plenum and of our performance in 1983.

Over the past 11 months railway transportation overfulfilled the plan for freight transportation by 56 million tons. This is the kind of pace we have achieved. All railways, all 32 railways have fulfilled the transportation plan. We must not only consolidate the positive shift that occurred in our industry's performance in 1983, but we must also attempt to improve upon it.

We have started December in a powerful way. Yesterday we dispatched 650,000 tons above plan. We have full confidence that the tasks of 1983 will not only be fulfilled but will also be overfulfilled by us.

The biggest shortcomings we have not solved are in services to passengers. This problem remains unresolved. We are very embarrassed. We believe that we are being rightly criticized. We are working hard and are further intensifying this work to reduce these shortcomings.

As for freight transportation, our dissatisfaction today is with the quality of work. timber transportation is still going badly. We are still not exporting certain kinds of machinery on time. This is one of the tasks we plan to perform more efficiently in 1984. Much work remains to be done. We need to stride into 1984 solidly, powerfully, so that people will say: Railway transportation has put its house in order. This is what we are striving for.

RSFSR, ARMENIA MEET AGRICULTURAL SALES TARGETS

PM301111 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Nov 83 First Edition p 1

[USSR Central Statistical Administration report: "To the State's Silos"]

[Text] The RSFSR's agricultural workers, who are implementing the decisions of the 26th party congress and CPSU Central Committee plenums and the targets of the Food Program, have carried out a well organized harvest and have fulfilled the plan for the sale to the state of vegetables, fruit, cucurbits, and high-grade leaf tea.

The republic's kolkhozes and sovkhozes have sent procurement centers and processing enterprises 8.0 million metric tons of vegetables, 1.6 million metric tons of fruit, 796,000 metric tons of cucurbits, and 7,800 tons of high-grade leaf tea.

The plans for the supply of fruits, vegetables, and cucurbits to the country's cities and industrial centers have been fulfilled.

The Armenian SSR's agricultural workers, who are implementing the decisions of the 26th party congress and CPSU Central Committee plenums and the targets of the Food Program, have fulfilled their socialist pledges for the sale to the state of grain, vegetables, potatoes, sugar beets, and fruit.

The republic's farms have sent procurement centers and processing enterprises 303,000 metric tons of vegetables, 101,000 metric tons of potatoes, 142,000 metric tons of sugar beets, and 122,000 metric tons of fruit.

The plan for the supply of potatoes to the country's cities and industrial centers has been fulfilled.

SEED PROCUREMENT, IMPROVEMENT 'IMMEDIATE' TASK

PM021138 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 1 Dec 83 p 1

["Agricultural Review" prepared by specialists from the High-Quality Seeds Administration of the USSR Ministry of Procurement, the USSR Ministry of Procurement, and the SELSKAYA ZHIZN editorial board: "High-Quality Seeds"]

[Text] As they approach the end of the current agricultural year the rural working people are already showing concern for the next harvest. They attach foremost significance in this to the preparation of high-quality seeds. The quality of the grains that will be placed in the soil next spring will determine to a large extent the yield from each seeded hectar and the output of land cultivation products.

The stored quantity of seeds for spring crops this year is somewhat larger than last year. Special attention has been given to the storing of sufficient reserves for the grain fields. The farms have at their disposal larger quantities of seeds for pulse crops as one source of plant protein for food and food purposes and for raising soil fertility. A considerable contribution to this has been made by the farmers of the RSFSR's Central Chernozem and Volga Regions and of the Ukrainian SSR. Work is now almost completed on the storing and procurement of state reserves of buckwheat, millet and rice seeds, and ways are being sought to supplement the seed stocks of barley and oats, so as to enable all kolkhozes and sovkhozes to fulfill the spring sowing plan both as a whole and for the individual crops.

Nevertheless, the storing of the necessary reserves is only half of the matter, the start of the great and crucial job of bringing the seeds up to the highest sowing standards.

Today this is the main element of daily work by the agronomic services of the appropriate agro-industrial complex subdivisions. The Ukrainian rural workers are losing no time. Now the quality of 96 percent of seeds here is up to the state all-union standards, and over 80 percent of them have been rated first-class. The preparation of seeds on the farms has been assigned to special teams and links. The collectives of 40 plants under the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Procurement's High-Quality Seeds Administration [Sortsemprom] are working in parallel with them. This important work is highly organized also on many Belorussian, Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian farms.

Much attention is also being given to seed reserves in many places in the RSFSR. This applies mainly to kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and agro-industrial associations in Belgorod, Voronezh, Lipetsk, Tambov, Volgograd, Ulyanovsk, and Saratov Oblasts, where practically all seeds are up to high sowing standards. The farms in Pskov, Bryansk, and Vladimir Olbasts have also taken steps toward ensuring good seed materials for the spring sowing.

The grain crop harvest in the Urals, Siberia, and North Kazakhstan this year took place under complex weather conditions. But wherever the appropriate organizational work had been done, the kolkhozes and sovkhozes managed to establish seed reserves to meet all the requirements and are now actively preparing them for the spring. This work is progressing best of all in Altay Kray. Over two-thirds of all inspected seeds there are up to high standards. Karaganda Oblast already has 86 percent of its seeds up to standard, while some sovkhozes, like Industrialnyy, Kuybyshev, and Rodnikovskiy, have their seeds fully prepared for sowing.

But this is not the situation everywhere, unfortunately. Farms in Armenia have only 54 percent of their seeds up to standard, and in Azerbaijan the figure is about 57 percent. The situation is no better in Georgia. Tula Oblast cannot complain about bad weather. Nevertheless, its farms are last but one in the Central Economic Region in terms of seed preparation. And Tula farmers are not short on experience in this work. First-class seeds are planted each year at the Lenin Kolkhoz, whose chairman is V.A. Starodubtsev and whose chief agronomist is V.P. Gorelov. Excellent seeds here have also been procured by the Novaya Zhizn Kolkhoz and the Avangard, Pershino, and Krasnoye Sovkhozes. So why cannot the oblast's other farms organize their work in the same way instead of having over one-third of their seeds below the standard requirements, not to mention the seeds' classification?

Much still remains to be done by the agronomic service of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and rayon agro-industrial associations in Kurgan Olbast. So far, up to 69 percent of seed material here does not meet the requirements of the impurity content standard. Large batches of grain show increased moisture content. Matters are no better in Chelyabinsk, Novosibirsk, Tyumen, Irkutsk, and Chita Oblasts. Many of the Kazakh SSR's kolkhozes and sovkhozes are working below their full capacity, and only 56 percent of stored seeds have been inspected for sowing qualities. The work with seeds is not progressing at full speed in Pavlodar, North Kazakhstan, and Alma-Ata Oblasts.

Seed preparation must be speeded up at the enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Procurement. The elevators and reception centers in Orenburg, Perm, and Tyumen Oblasts have to all intents and purposes not yet started to clean the seed grain and raise its quality to the requirements of the first class.

Exchange operations and the selection from state resources of high-quality seeds which are up to standard must be speeded up in the eastern economic regions, and measures must be taken to dry and clean the existing stocks. Special attention here must be given to ensuring that each farm is supplied with first-class strong and hard wheat seeds, enabling them to fulfill unconditionally the state plans for the purchase of this valuable grain.

Work on cleaning sunflower seeds and bringing them up to high sowing standards is progressing slowly. Out of the 55,000 metric tons stored by the beginning of November, only a little more than one-half has been checked at the state seeds inspectorates. Only one-third of that amount has been passed as meeting the standards, with the remainder being unprepared, mainly in terms of impurity content and humidity. Cleaning and size grading is progressing slowly in many farms of the Volga and Central Chernozem Regions, the North Caucasus autonomous republics, and a large number of the Ukraine's oblasts and rayons. In order to further expand the area sown with hybrid sunflowers it is important to use all existing seed for sowing purposes.

A certain amount of work has been done this year to improve the supply of perennial grass seeds to farms. The variety range of these seeds has been extended. Alfalfa and clover seeds have been stored in larger quantities than before. Good work in this connection has been done by the Kirghiz SSR farmers, who have contributed about 6,000 metric tons of alfalfa seed to the all-union stock, against the planned 2,500 metric tons. Significant quantities have already been shipped from here to Belorussia, the Baltic Region, and the RSFSR's Nonchernozem zone.

Meanwhile, the plans for the delivery of alfalfa seeds and perennial herbaceous grasses to the all-union stock for the country as a whole have been fulfilled by just over 50 percent. Their procurement is progressing intolerably slowly on Ukrainian farms, where alfalfa procurement plans are only 12-percent fulfilled and not a single metric ton of herbaceous grass seeds has been delivered.

Great concern must be shown for the timely and high-standard decontamination of seeds. At present a number of farms and rayons, and several enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Procurement are applying progressive methods to this work. Use is made of film-forming preparations, which ensure the disinfection and reliable protection of seeds in the soil against the effect of unfavorable weather conditions. The point is to speed up the transition to sowing corn and sunflower seeds with film-forming coating and increase the area on which such grain and other agricultural crops seed is sown.

High-quality, biologically pure seeds have been considered since ancient times to be the golden fund of the harvest. To establish reserves sufficient to meet the requirements for them, including fallback reserves, and to prepare them as rapidly as possible largely up to first-class requirements -- this is the immediate task of farm leaders and specialists, Sortsemprom subdivisions, the Ministry of Procurement, and of workers in the country's agro-industrial associations.

'STRUGGLE' NECESSARY TO CORRECT REPAIR SITUATION

PM021210 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Nov 83 First Edition p 1

[Vladimir Mikhaylov "Economic Review": "Busy Time in the Workshops"]

[Excerpt] This winter will undoubtedly be a serious test of how resolutely the subunits of the State Committee for the Supply of Production Equipment for Agriculture [Goskomselkhoztekhnika] are changing course and to what extent they are oriented toward the national economy end result as required by the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) Plenum. There are some improvements in this regard. Many rayon associations in Orenburg Oblast, for instance, are taking the management of the farms' engineering services upon themselves. There are increasing numbers of Selkhoztekhnika associations and branches whose leaders are not narrowing the service sphere as in the past, but striving to expand it. This is typical of the Tatar republican committee working in close contact with the autonomous republic's Ministry of Agriculture.

And yet there are still many complaints about the Goskomselkhoztekhnika. Even now its subunits often draw up their own plans on the basis of purely departmental interests, taking no account of farms' demands and requests. Partly for this reason the Goskomselkhoztekhnika repairs no more than 10 percent of the silage-harvesting combines required. Less is being done than should be to restore grain-harvesting units too. To a certain extent this is also a consequence of miscalculations in making enterprises more specialized. Often specialized enterprises were built not in addition to general workshops, but instead of them, without taking strict account of the transportation of machines. As a result, kolkhozes and sovkhozes have sometimes been forced to deliver, for instance, combines for repair dozens of kilometers away.

There is a need to have in every region highly qualified general workshops where people are prepared to service all kinds of machines. In this case, as in others, the rayon agro-industrial association should use the power given to it more decisively. The combination of specialized production facilities and sections, and broadly based shops that would best meet the needs of the actual producers of agricultural products must be found.

Flexibility and well balanced, well thought out approach to solving organizational and technical tasks presuppose constant concern for improving the organization of repairs. Progressive techniques and an advanced organization of labor are now not only desirable: If we do not introduce them we will simply not have finished by the spring. The collective contract in particular has much to offer. In Goskomselkhoztekhnika workshops it is used quite widely, but among kolkhoz and sovkhoz repair workers it is not catching on so well. Due importance is clearly not being attached to it in Gorkiy, Volgograd, and Perm Oblasts. Yet there are many examples of its high effectiveness on farms too. In particular, good results are regularly achieved by the repair team at the Zalarinskiy Sovkhoz in Irkutsk Oblast.

Bringing agricultural engineering services up to a qualitatively new level makes it possible to pose the question of savings more keenly: At the moment repair workers, as a rule, do not keep within the normatives set for them, success is sometimes achieved at the cost of enormous overexpenditure of labor and resources -- basically, at the cost of thriftlessness. A kind of wastefulness record was set by Tula Oblast: It seems that in 1981 each tractor there was repaired two or three times, and the Tula repair services' losses run into six figures.

One can often hear it said today that the existing system of incentives for machine operators to make savings needs updating and clarification. And that is true. With one essential amendment: It is at the same time even more important to make wider use of the incentives that are today allowed by law. At the moment one in two farms does not use them. Why not? Maybe they are ineffective? Not so. By implementing them the Kirov Kolkhoz in Rudnyanskiy Rayon, Smolensk Oblast, saved 37 percent of its repair budget. Almost one-third of the savings was paid to the machine operators. A substantial sum, but this is justified expenditure: Besides, it is also recouped in the greater reliability and longer life of the machinery.

Unfortunately the Goskomselkhoztekhnika also contributes to what has become chronic overexpenditure. Many of its subunits are, as before, profit-chasing, therefore often where it would be enough to replace a single component a new assembly is fitted, and in those cases where routine repairs would suffice a complete overhaul is carried out. It is also worth noting that in the Goskomselkhoztekhnika's pledges for this year, in general well thought out and sufficiently intensive, there is nothing concrete, indicating precisely specified sums, providing for a reduction in kolkhoz and sovkhoz expenditure on repairs.

There is no question that in terms of pressure and complexity, the busy time in the workshops is in no way inferior to the harvest toil in the fields and meadows. The machine operators also have many difficulties of an objective nature: The repair base has not yet attained the necessary might; there is an acute shortage of many spare parts; and their quality leaves something to be desired. But even so, equipment must not be left unrepaired. This means that people must decide to overcome difficulties and not seek out beforehand justifications for possible failure. It is worth noting that this year's initiators of the repair workers' competition -- the Mari machine operators -- are now near the bottom as regards workshop availability. But they do not give in. They build temporary premises, crowd the garages, organize two shifts, and seek other ways out. In short they wage a stubborn, persistent struggle against any and every circumstance that is inauspicious for them. Take heed of this word that has become habitual for us: "struggle." What it implies is precisely devotion, selflessness, and persistence in achieving one's goal.

KOLKHOZES, SOVKHOZES USE STATE BANK CREDIT

LD060011 Moscow TASS in English 1327 GMT 5 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow December 5 TASS -- Credits of the USSR State Bank have become an important lever for the development of collective and state farms. Collective farms use credits for the construction of stock-rearing farm buildings, purchase of farm machinery and breeder cattle to the tune of almost 4,000 million roubles a year. The Chapayev Collective Farm in the Stavropol Region (Northern Caucasus), for instance, has built a modern farm for growing high-yielding cows with a bank credit worth 1.3 million roubles. By selling young stock to other farms, the Chapayev farm speedily recouped credits and has turned into a highly profitable farm.

The State Bank expands crediting operations with each year. As much as 26,400 million roubles in short-term and 3,500 million roubles in long-term credits were extended to state-owned farms alone in the past year. This is more than in the preceding years.

The crediting policy in the is wholly subordinated to the interests of the development of agriculture and realization of the Food Programme. [sentence as received] This is the reason behind a low interest rate on credits, which is levied by the bank. Viktor Kochkarev, head of the department for crediting state owned farms of the board of the USSR State Bank, told a TASS correspondent that an annual rate of interest for long-term credit is only 0.75 per cent and for short-term credit -- one per cent. It is only for a credit, which was not repayed in time, that the farm will have to pay a three per cent interest rate.

In order to obtain a credit the farm is to supply data on its production and financial plan, and a substantiation that the credit is indispensable for expanding production and increasing output in agriculture. A short-term credit is extended for a term of up to a year, while a long-term one -- up to twenty years, if it is channelled into large-scale production plans, above all capital construction.

ARMED FORCES POLITICAL SEMINAR HELD 28 NOV - 3 DEC

PM051159 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 83 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Seminar Ends Its Work"]

[Text] An all-union seminar-conference of lecturers from party committees and political organs of the USSR Armed Forces was held in Moscow 28 November-3 December. Reports and lectures were heard on the theory and practice of improving the developed socialist society, the international activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state, and the party's organizational and ideological work in light of the decisions of the 26th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums and of the propositions and conclusions contained in the speeches of Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The participants in the seminar were addressed by V.I. Dolgikh and B.N. Ponomarev, candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee; M.V. Zimyanin and N.I. Ryzhkov, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee; G.I. Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology; Ye.K. Ligachev, V.I. Stukalin, and V.F. Shauro, chiefs of CPSU Central Committee departments, V.G. Zakharov, O.B. Rakhmanin, R.A. Ulyanovskiy and N.N. Chetverikov, deputy chiefs of CPSU Central Committee departments; academician A.G. Yegorov, director of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism: V.V. Fedorchuk, USSR minister of internal affairs; Ye.P. Velikhov, Yu.A. Ovchinnikov, and P.N. Fedoseyev, vice presidents of the USSR Academy of Sciences; USSR Deputy Foreign Minister M.S. Kapitsa; F.D. Bobkov, deputy chairman of the USSR KGB; Colonel General N.F. Chernov, chief of a directorate of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff; responsible officials from the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Gosplan; and scientists and journalists.

A conference of leaders of party committee lecture groups took place and questions of further raising the ideological and theoretical standards and efficiency of lecture propaganda were discussed.

Yepishev Addresses Meeting

PM051057 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Dec 83 Second Edition p 6

[Unnamed "Our Correspondent" report: "Lecturers' Tasks Discussed"]

[Text] A conference of Army and Navy political organ lecturers has been held. The conference participants discussed topical questions of further improving lecture propaganda in light of the demands of the CPSU Central Committee November (1983) Plenum and exchanged experiences on work to improve its ideological and theoretical standard and effectiveness. They examined the specific tasks of ideological cadres in mobilizing personnel to fulfill the USSR defense minister's demands in the sphere of combat and political training, of strengthening military discipline, and of improving the combat readiness of units, ships, and formations.

Army General A.A. Yepishev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, addressed the Army and Navy lecturers.